HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXXVII JANUARY, 1944 NUMBER 1

THE OLDER BOOK OF ESTHER

CHARLES C. TORREY

YALE UNIVERSITY

ON SEVERAL counts, Esther is the strangest book in the Bible. Few of those who read it realize what a variety of curious problems it presents, and how little has been done toward solving them. As a preliminary to the following study, a few of the most troublesome questions raised by the book may be briefly stated.

1. Why is there no Greek translation of the Hebrew text? Every other book of the Hebrew Bible, whatever its nature, has its faithful rendering (at least one, often several) in Greek. For the canonical Esther, on the contrary, no such version is extant, nor is there evidence that one ever existed, in spite of the great popularity which the story enjoyed from the first.

2. How is the "non-religious" appearance of the book to be accounted for? The Jews were *always* religious, no people more so. Their faith was the one thing that they could never give up. The story of Esther certainly signified to every one of them the care of God for Israel; every new turn of events, in its unfolding plot, meant to them divine intervention. No one could doubt this. Why is the familiar religious phraseology absent? The book was not the mere precipitation of one man's faith, or lack of faith, it professed to speak for the whole Jewish people. There is something here which has not been fully understood.

3. What is the true history of the so-called Additions to Esther, now contained in the Old Testament Apocrypha? The main reason for making the additions, it is commonly said, was the wish of the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt to give to the story of Esther the religious atmosphere that is so sadly lack-

ing in the Hebrew version. In fact, however, Addition C [1] (or XIII, 1–30) appended to Chapter 4, containing the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, is the only one of the supposed expansions which contributes notably to this end. Moreover, a note appended at a very early date to the Greek version of the book asserts that the complete form was originally Palestinian! And finally, four of the six "expansions," A, C, D, and F, are plainly translations from Semitic.

4. Is there any reasonable explanation of the strange *epilogue* (10: 1–3) which stands at the end of the Hebrew Esther? It consists of a curious little string of platitudes, which have no apparent purpose here, nor value. The opening sentence, as a recent writer declares, "has appeared to all modern commentators as a trivial remark which evidently has not the least connexion with the preceding events." And indeed, the only effect of this "chapter" of three verses is to spoil the ending of the book. Why was it written?

5. What is the "Second Letter" mentioned in 9: 29? There have been many attempts, all futile, as will be shown, to answer this question.

Up to the present time, no one of these outstanding puzzles has been given a satisfactory explanation. In the following pages the attempt will be made to throw some light on each and all of them. In a brief review of Volume III, Part I, of The Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1940, published in the Journal of Biblical Literature, 61 (1942), pp. 130–136, the present writer pointed out certain facts, not hitherto recognized, which make necessary a new approach to the interpretation of the book of Esther. Further study has clarified some things which at that time were obscure. The main conclusion there stated, that *the two extant Greek versions of the book are translations from Aramaic originals*, will be given further illustration in the course of the following investigation.

The students of Biblical science (both Old Testament and New Testament), and of the language-history of Palestine, have need to recognize fully the fact that the literary language

[1] Employing the convenient designation adopted by the Cambridge LXX and Swete's Old Testament in Greek.

of the Jewish people in their home land, employed by them in every field of learning or of popular entertainment, was the "standard" Aramaic, the same which for many centuries had been the most widely used literary medium in all Western Asia. Hebrew, persisting as a learned and sacred tongue, reserved for religious writings during the last centuries B.C., was no longer in use by the Jewish public. Greek, with all its prestige and its firm hold in almost every part of the Hellenistic territory, had comparatively little use among the Jews of Palestine. These facts, which in recent years have been gradually coming to light, have interesting illustration in the book now before us.

The principal Greek version of Esther has no counterpart in the books of the Greek Old Testament, in its disregard of the Hebrew text. While it tells the same story, and consequently agrees closely and very often verbally with the Hebrew version where the narrative is the same, yet the fact is conspicuous that it bears no such relation to the canonical text as is the case in every other book of the so-called "Septuagint." It is strange that the true state of affairs has not been seen by the scholars, ancient and modern, who have dealt with the book. On the ground of the supposed analogy with the other Biblical books it has universally been taken for granted that the Greek texts of Esther, or at least the one which is better known, must have been derived, in some way, from the Hebrew; although any really thorough examination shows that this is not the case. All the modern textbooks of Introduction to the Old Testament scriptures speak of the "LXX" version of Esther (here the conventional term is utterly out of place!), and the same mistaken assumption is made in all the commentaries and other treatises.

The unusual character of the supposed translation has of course been given a certain amount of attention. Theodor Nöldeke, in the Encyclopaedia Biblica, article "Esther," II, col. 1406, says: "The tendency, so common at the present day, to overestimate the importance of the LXX for purposes of textual criticism is nowhere more to be deprecated than in the

Book of Esther. It may be doubted whether even in a single passage of the book the Greek MSS. enable us to emend the Hebrew text." Like many others, Nöldeke thought that the Greek must have undergone extensive corruption. The Hebrew text, on the contrary, seemed to him, as to most scholars, to have been very well preserved.

Jacob Hoschander, in his Book of Esther in the Light of History (1923), pp. 2 ff., has the following theory to account for the Greek's eccentricities. An Alexandrian Jew, while sojourning in Palestine or Syria, became well acquainted with the Hebrew book, "at a time before the text was greatly corrupted." After his return to Egypt, where Purim was still unknown, he made "a free and periphrastic translation" from memory, having no copy of the Hebrew. Not remembering the (very numerous) proper names, he substituted others, equally serviceable for his purpose. Other serious differences are due, Hoschander thinks, partly to faulty recollection or misunderstanding of the original, partly to subsequent corruption of the Hebrew text. This theory at least takes full account of the difficulties, but it is very far from solving them.

Swete's Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (1900), p. 257, takes the usual view, that we have here one of the "Septuagint" versions, made from the Hebrew. "In the Greek Esther we reach the maximum of interpolation. Of 270 verses, 107 are wanting in the present Hebrew text, and probably at no time formed a part of the Hebrew book."

Examination would show, however, that not even the remaining 163 verses are rendered from the Hebrew by our Greek; though in many cases the wording would be practically the same in any text or version.

If the history of translation were not so neglected by modern Biblical scholars, they would have known that our Greek Esther could not have been a rendering of the Hebrew. No Biblical translation of that day is even remotely parallel, nor could be. The hypothesis of textual corruption in the Greek is equally unacceptable; the sacred texts — and especially the later texts — were well preserved; such shocking neglect as this would have exemplified was quite impossible. Unquestion-

ably, the Greek Esther is a translation, but it was not made from any Hebrew text.

We have before us *two* books of Esther, differing widely from each other. These are:

I. The Hebrew book. This is the Esther of our canonical Old Testament, the story familiar to all.

II. The Greek compilation. This includes all of the matter that is in the Hebrew, and much more. It is extant in two distinct forms: 1. The "standard" text, found in all editions of the Greek Old Testament. 2. The so-called "Lucianic" text, represented by a small group of MSS., and published in certain editions as Esther A (the Greek alpha; more commonly the small letter, α, is used).[2]

These two Greek texts are mutually independent in their origin; but, as will be seen, Esther α derives a large part of its present material from Esther β. They were not derived, by manuscript transmission, from the same Greek archetype. Neither one, as has already been said, was derived from our Hebrew Esther; nor has their relation to the Hebrew version, or to each other, ever been thoroughly studied. Even the standard text, treated as "the LXX," has been greatly neglected, and is not well known to the ordinary student of the Old Testament. Esther α (which, as will be seen, is a document of unusual interest) is even less known. It is distinctly more archaic, and, in its setting, more correct [3] than Esther β. Aside from the name of the king, in which it agrees with the Hebrew, it has its own way of writing the name Vashti.

[2] Thus in Lagarde's Libri Vet. Test. canon. pars prior graece (1883), and the Cambridge Old Testament in Greek, III, Part I (1940). Fritzsche's Libri Apocryphi V.T. (1871) printed this text on the right-hand page, facing the "standard" text. (Some commentators, designating the two recensions by Roman capitals, have called the standard form Esther A, and the other Esther B.) A portion of the α-text, namely that which is contained in the so-called "Additions," was translated into English by E. C. Bissell in his Apocrypha of the Old Testament (1880). Aside from the "Additions," I am not aware that the β-text (called "the LXX") has ever been translated into a modern language.

[3] The coalition of "the Persians and Medes" (1: 3, 14, 18, 19) was by the Jewish writers believed to have been in existence in the time of Ahasuerus, but not of Artaxerxes I, as will be shown elsewhere.

The question of the language rendered by the Greek Esther is settled at once, conclusively, by the word designating the feast. It is not necessary to search in Elam, or Babylonia, or Persia, for the origin of the word *φουραια*, for it is simply the transliteration of פּוּרַיָּא, the Aramaic plural, determined, of the word פּוּר. The form occurs regularly in rabbinical Aramaic where the corresponding Hebrew would be הַפֻּרִים. It is expressly designated as plural in the Greek of 8: 63, 64 (Heb. 9: 28, 29), *τῶν φουραια*.[4] The form ΦΟΥΡΔΙΑ in Cod. m, in Esther *α*, 8: 49, whence Lagarde's *φουρδαια*, is merely the miswriting of ΦΟΥΡΑΙΑ- — an extremely common error.

The absolute state of the plural noun, פּוּרִין, is represented in the MSS. by the endings *-ιν*, *ειν*, *ην*, occasionally written instead of the correct *puraia* (where Hebrew has the article), simply because of the sound of the familiar name. Some cautious scribes, aware of the two readings, *puraia* and *purīn*, but unable to decide between them, combined them in a customary way, producing the monstrous forms *φουρινaια* (*φουρμαια*), Esther *α*, 8: 49, and *φρουραιηνα*, in the colophon of the *α*-text (see below).

Why is it that scholars have not interpreted *φουραια* correctly, when the Aramaic word stared them in the face? The answer is easy. Neither Jewish nor Christian scholars have understood the extraordinary situation as regards the language; the truth is only just now coming to light.

For more than eighteen centuries past, Aramaic has been a stepchild in the Jewish language-family. In its true character, as the chief medium employed by the Jews of Palestine in the last three or four centuries B.C. for their popular literature, it has been buried from sight. Very recently, in the case of book after book of the extra-canonical Jewish literature, books long supposed to have been either composed in Greek or translated from Hebrew, in the case also of certain of the earliest Christian writings (the Four Gospels, part of Acts, and the book of Revelation), it has been proved that the original language was Aramaic.

[4] The false writing *φρουρ-* is frequent, due to the influence of the verb *φρουρεῖν*, to guard, watch, etc. Also common is the abbreviated form *φ(ρ)ουραι*, for "Purim" has only two syllables, and *φρουραί* is a good Greek word.

There is good evidence that at some time near the year 100 of the present era the Jews destroyed, systematically and thoroughly, *the popular literature* in the two languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, and provided that no more should be written. The output of edifying fiction, history, poetry, wisdom, science, apocalypse, etc., ceased suddenly and absolutely. The Christian Aramaic writings were of course destroyed along with the Jewish. Hebrew was given a new and flourishing existence; but Jewish Aramaic, used henceforth for interpretation of the Scriptures, for anecdotes in the vulgar tongue, etc., ceased utterly to be employed for literary compositions, and in the course of a century or more the fact that it had ever had such a place in Palestinian literature was completely forgotten,[5] and has remained practically unknown to the present day.

This being the case, it could not have occurred to any student of Esther, Jewish or Christian, that the book might have been composed in Aramaic.

It has already been said, in the preceding pages, that the two existing Greek versions are (in the main) mutually independent. They are in fact translated from different Aramaic originals. Such a popular favorite as the story of Esther and Purim must have circulated in many slightly differing forms; and indeed, in the extant material, including the version reproduced by Josephus, we seem to have testimony to four such texts, no two agreeing throughout.[6]

In the case of Esther *a* there is an important exception to be made. *It represents a separate Aramaic text only in 2: 1–8: 21*, this corresponding approximately to the first seven chapters of the Hebrew text. The explanation of this will appear presently. An interesting example of the two independent Greek translations is given by a phrase in Mordecai's prayer, 5: 19 (or C7) in the standard Greek, 5: 15 in the *a*-text, where Ara-

[5] Eventually, as in the third and fourth centuries, Aramaic was employed to translate from Greek the especially favorite Apocrypha, such books as First Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, and still others, as we learn from Origen and Jerome.

[6] In Josephus' account (Antt. 11, vi, 4), when the incident of Mordecai's discovery of the plot against the king is narrated, it is said that "Barnabazus, the servant of one of the eunuchs, being by birth a Jew, . . . discovered (the conspiracy) to the queen's uncle." As Nöldeke remarked (Ency. Bibl. II, article "Esther"), it is not likely that Josephus invented this; it was in his source.

maic *b'ithnassā'āh* is rendered by *'εν ὑπερηφανίᾳ*, "in pride," in the former text, and by *'εν πειρασμῷ*, "in rivalry" (with Haman, to *test* him) in the other. Both renderings are perfectly regular, for the word is ambiguous, belonging to either one of two different Aramaic roots, the one corresponding to Hebrew נשׂא, the other to Hebrew נסה.

Another example, more amusing, is in 5: 11 f. of the Greek versions, in a portion of the narrative which the Hebrew has omitted. Something described by the word רעתא (=רעתא) appears on the face of somebody. According to Esther *β* it is good will, רַעֲתָא, on the face of the king; in Esther *α* it is perspiration, דֵּעֲתָא, on the face of the queen. The former is correct; Esther admits no mere fright, but represents herself as overcome with awe and admiration: "I saw thee, my lord, as an angel of God, and my heart was shaken with awe at thy glory; for thou art wonderful, my lord, and *thy face is full of good will* (*χαρίτων μεστόν*)." Esther *α* has quite a different ending: "I saw thee as an angel of God, and my heart was dissolved at the glory of thy wrath, my lord." And *her face was covered with perspiration* (*καὶ ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτῆς μέτρον ἱδρῶτος*). It is obvious that in both Aramaic texts the phrase was מלא רעתא!

Esther *α* has a characteristic bit of translation Greek in 7: 5. Ahasuerus has just learned that he owes his life to Mordecai, who nevertheless has been given neither reward nor acknowledgment. He asks of his attendants, "What shall we do for Mordecai, *the savior of his lord* (Aram. מְשֵׁיזֵב מָרֵיהּ)?" Some scribe, accustomed to follow this participle with the preposition *min*, carelessly wrote ממריה; and the translator, compelled to read this as מֵמָרֵיהּ, of course rendered literally, *τῷ σωτῆρι τῶν λόγων*!

Esther *β* presents an astonishing specimen of Greek in 9: 30 (9: 65 in Lagarde): *καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος καὶ Ἐσθὴρ ἡ βασίλισσα ἔστησαν ἑαυτοῖς καθ' ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τότε στήσαντες κατὰ τῆς ὑγιείας ἑαυτῶν καὶ τὴν βούλην αὐτῶν.* This is partly inner Greek corruption and partly mistranslation. The Aramaic text which was rendered must have corresponded to the latter part of Heb. 9: 31, and the true rendering would seem to have been: *καὶ* M. *καὶ* 'E. *ἡ βασίλισσα ἔστησαν ἑαυτοῖς κατ' αὐτῶν, καθότι ἔστησαν τὰ κατὰ τὰς*

νηστείας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν κραυγὴν αὐτῶν. Compare with this the Hebrew verse 9:31. Τὰς νηστείας is found here in the Moscow cursive 311 (merely a conjecture?). The Aramaic word for "cry of distress," קְבִיחָא (employed in Targ. Esth. I, 4: 1, for Mordecai's lamentation!), was taken by the Greek translator as קַבָּלְתָא, "acceptance, approval," the infinitive of the verb קַבֵּל, just employed in vs. 27; hence the βούλην. This Aramaic version, represented by the Greek, contained the provision for the annual fast.

Further illustration of this nature, showing the origin of the two Greek texts, is unnecessary.

It appears, therefore, that we have to deal with *a twofold Semitic tradition* of the Esther narrative: the brief Hebrew version which lies before us in our canonical book, and a considerably longer Aramaic narrative now existing in Greek in two distinct forms, both quite unknown to modern scholars as of Aramaic origin and as in part representing two distinct translations. It is a most important question, which literary form, the Hebrew or the Aramaic, the shorter or the longer, is the original. In the lack of any clear evidence, either hypothesis would seem reasonable; a brief story might have been freely expanded, or a detailed narrative might have been abridged. In the present case, by good fortune, there are not a few plain indications, and in the following pages the attempt will be made to settle the question.

A fact which would seem, at the outset, to have its bearing on the matter is the notoriously "unreligious" appearance of the *Hebrew* book in all its parts. As was remarked, above, there has been no satisfactory explanation of this peculiarity, which, added to the apparent delight in the massacre of the Jews' enemies, has caused the book of Esther to be roundly condemned. Martin Luther's opinion is well known: "I am so hostile to the book that I wish it did not exist." The following typical characterizations are quoted from some of the best-known modern authorities, foreign or domestic.

"The book is so conspicuously lacking in religion that it never should have been included in the Canon of the Old Testament."

"The compilers of the Hebrew canon made a serious blunder when they took in this book."

"An almost grotesque expression of hatred of the Gentiles."

"The author's bitter hatred of the heathen, probably unparalleled in ferocity."

"From the moral point of view the book has little to commend it to civilized persons."

Now this is in part conventional exaggeration. It is true that from any point of view the Hebrew Esther seems hardly fitted to form a part of "the only perfect rule of faith and practice" (as the Westminster divines styled the Bible). But on the other hand it is not true that the religious atmosphere is wholly lacking. All designations of God are avoided, indeed; there is no mention of prayer, nor use of the customary religious formulas; no reference to the past history of Israel with its thrilling record of divine help. These things are *studiously* avoided for some reason — which may be a good reason; the case of First Maccabees, a truly religious book, is somewhat similar. As was said above, where this subject was first touched upon, no one of the early Jewish readers of the book could ever have doubted that it was a record of the working of God in behalf of his chosen people, rescuing them from danger in one strange turn of events after another.

There is in the story one significant phrase, noticed by all commentators but hardly given its full value; the words spoken by Mordecai to Esther in 4: 14: "If thou holdest thy peace at this time, then shall relief and deliverance arise to the Jews *from another place.*" From what place? (In like fashion Simon the Maccabee says to his sons, in 1 Macc. 16: 3: "Now I am old, but you, by the mercy [whose mercy?] are of sufficient age; go forth and fight for our nation.") There is no question as to Mordecai's meaning; Esther understands it perfectly, and acts upon it by fasting for three days; a purely religious act, though the mention of prayer, like that of the deity, is avoided for some reason. Mordecai's faith in the God of Israel is firm, and is plainly expressed; Esther shares it, whether the deliverance is to come through her or not.

The "hatred of the Gentiles" — that is, of those particular Gentiles who had planned a wholesale massacre of the Jews

and were about to undertake it — is natural enough; but the dwelling on the note of revenge, and on the satisfaction taken by the Jews in the slaughter of their foes (including the women and children; 8: 11) creates a picture which is revolting. There is a *literary* problem here, rather than a moral problem, and the solution will be found to relieve considerably the impression made by these details; for they were not in the original plan of the book, but were introduced later for a purely literary purpose. While this does not render them less unpleasant, it relieves the author of the story of Esther of the charge of "ferocity."

Might not the strange avoidance of religious terminology in the book (while the presence of religious feeling is unquestionable) find its explanation in the manner of celebrating the feast? More than one Jewish scholar, familiar with the ancient tradition of the observance, and knowing also the deep-rooted fear of blasphemy, has raised the question. The Jews did not, in fact, class Purim as a religious festival, to be approached in a devotional mood; it was rather a joyous, nay, a *hilarious* celebration. From the earliest times and down through the middle ages there were masquerades, burnings in effigy, and noisy gatherings. The children broke loose in pranks of every sort, and their elders set them the example. The Jews have always been relatively abstemious, not given to drunkenness, though by no means inclined to prohibition; but the feast of Purim had a program of its own. There is in the Talmud (Megillah, 7b) a recommendation for one feature of the celebration which must have delighted many thirsty souls: "Drink wine until you are no longer able to distinguish between 'Blessed be Mordecai' and 'Cursed be Haman.'" Where merrymakers, even a few, were likely to be found in this condition, it was imperative that the festal document should contain no sacred name or term which might be uttered carelessly.

This suggestion, however, was seen to have no value for the solution of the problem *as it was stated.* The manner of celebrating the feast was not originally prescribed, nor foreseen. In the Hebrew Esther there is not a word which could be taken to imply any unusual hilarity in the festivities. Truly decisive

is the testimony furnished by the standard Greek version, with its colophon. At the time when this translation from an Aramaic text was made (in Jerusalem!) and brought to Egypt, the feast of Purim was well established, and the manner of its observance was perfectly known to the Egyptian translators. At that time (114 B.C., see below) no objection was felt in Jerusalem to including in the festal document the frequent mention of God, the usual religious phrases, and prayers quoted *in extenso*. This is certain. If the Hebrew book is the original Esther (as no one has doubted hitherto), then its "unreligious" appearance has nothing to do with the nature of the celebration of the feast, and it cannot be given this excuse. If, on the contrary, it is a late revision suited to the character which the feast had gradually assumed, then the reproaches which have been heaped upon the book as a Godless composition are gone in a twinkling. There are certain obvious facts of structure and development which in their combination seem to yield a sure conclusion.

The Book of Esther combines two distinct motives, the one literary, the other historical. There is, first, an exciting story, very skilfully constructed; joined to this is the account of the origin of the feast of Purim.

The story is the work of a narrator of no ordinary ability, one who wrote clearly and concisely and knew how to produce his dramatic effects. His theme is the triumph of right over wrong; more specifically, the deliverance of a Jewish multitude from impending massacre, through divine intervention.

The scene is the court of the Medo-Persian King, Ahasuerus. One of the attendants at the palace is a Jew of noble lineage, named Mordecai. He happens to discover a plot against the life of the king. When he gives information of this, the conspirators are executed; and the account of the plot and of Mordecai's service in foiling it is written in the records of the reign.

The kingdom needed a queen. Ahasuerus had put away his consort, after a spectacular episode narrated in the opening chapter. Candidates for the coveted office were now being tested, in competition. Esther, the ward and cousin of Mor-

decai, met with greater favor than any of the others. By command from Mordecai, she kept silence as to her Jewish origin; this merely for the sake of the story.

Here enters the villain, Haman. He and Mordecai are hereditary enemies; a brilliant touch, giving the tale connection with old Hebrew history. Mordecai traces his lineage to Kish, the father of Saul, while Haman is descended from Agag, the king of the Amalekites, Saul's foe (1 Sam. 15: 4 ff.).[7] Haman, being a favorite of the king, determines to destroy not only his adversary but also all the Jews in the kingdom. Through misrepresentation he obtains from the king an order for the general slaughter, on a designated day. The letters are sent out, and Mordecai and Esther hear the news.

The main rôle is now Esther's. She goes to the king at the risk of her life. He is angry at first; but as she falls in a faint, he is conquered by her beauty and her distress, and promises to grant her request, "even to the half of the kingdom." She invites the king and Haman to a banquet; and as it progresses, and the king would know her great request, she postpones her answer to the following day, promising to announce it at a repetition of the banquet. The suspense is thus redoubled, and time is gained for a new episode. Haman goes home in triumph, and erects on his premises a gallows for hanging Mordecai.

At this juncture, by chance, the king had a restless night. The records were brought to him, and he learned how his life had been saved through Mordecai's faithfulness. As he finished reading, at dawn, it happened that Haman was at the door, seeking early permission to hang his Jewish enemy. What resulted was Mordecai's triumphal ride through the city, and the discomfiture and humiliation of his conductor, Haman. The latter is now warned, by his wife.

At the second banquet, the well-prepared finish comes quickly. Esther's postponed request is now in order. She pleads to the king for her life and the life of her people, and accuses Haman. He is condemned to death, and hanged on the gallows which he had prepared for his rival. His estate is given

[7] The Greek is corrupt at this point, but the cause of its corruption (from Ἀγαγαῖος) can be conjectured with probability. One MS. of the α-text still has γωγαιος.

to Mordecai, who now appears on the scene, makes himself known as Esther's cousin, and secures from the king the annulling of the order to massacre the Jews.

Here the story, as such, has its end. It is now complete in every detail, and any addition or expansion would mar it. As will presently be shown, it is in the two extant Greek versions that the literary qualities of the narrative are best seen, the Hebrew being inferior in this regard. In the Greek, the aim of the author of the story to make it artistic in detail is very evident, and his skill as an artist is beyond question. More than this, it now seems possible to show, for the first time, that the aim of at least one writer of the Esther narrative (whether the original author or not) was *purely* literary; not to promote the observance of a feast day, nor to record the triumph of the Jews over their enemies, but merely to tell a good story for its own sake; a story of universal appeal, to be enjoyed not only by the Jews but also by the members of every other nation.

As has just been said, the brilliantly conceived little drama naturally ends with the execution of the arch plotter, the annulment of his circular letter, and the elevation of Mordecai. Here, if the Esther story should be dramatized for popular entertainment, the curtain would fall, and THE END would be written. The three chapters which follow in the Hebrew and the standard Greek are taken up with the vengeance of the Jews on their enemies, the hanging and exposure on the gallows of the ten sons of Haman (not mentioned in the preceding story), the slaughter in Susa and the provinces, and the institution of an annual feast; matters very interesting and important to the Jews, but of no interest or importance to the rest of the world. Here, moreover, the character of the "Greek" narrative changes very noticeably; it now has none of the qualities of a folk-tale, but is simply the history of Purim.

A fact of obvious importance, which apparently no one has ever noticed, is that one of the two Greek versions, Esther *a*, *ended at exactly the point just indicated, the place where the folk-tale ends.* Whatever this may be found to signify, there can be no question as to the fact itself. Up to, and including, verse 13 in chapter 8 of this version, its material is the same as

that which is found in the first seven chapters of the Hebrew and the standard Greek (Esther β); of course with the variation resulting from the fact that it is mainly an independent translation made from a slightly differing Aramaic text. The ending, verses 14–17, is as follows:

The king said to Esther, Did he plan to hang Mordecai, the man who saved me from the hand of the eunuchs? Did he not know that Esther herself is of his lineage? And the king summoned Mordecai, and endowed him with all of Haman's estate. The king moreover said to him, Name your wish, and I will grant it. And Mordecai said, It is that you annul Haman's letter. And the king gave into his hands the affairs of the kingdom.

This is not only a perfect ending of the story, it is also *the* ending, precisely, which was intended by the author of this particular version, whatever its history. From this point on, the relation of Esther α to Esther β is completely changed. In the preceding chapters, the α-Greek (that is, in the story proper, the folk-tale)was quite independent of the β-Greek, being a separate translation and from a different Aramaic text. In the chapters which now follow, and indeed in every other part of this version — including the dream of Mordecai at the beginning and its interpretation in the final chapter — *its text is derived from the β-text*, as any careful reader of the Greek can see; with only the variation usual in reproductions from memory.

That is, the α-version of the tale was subsequently built out, in this most natural way, so that it might tell the whole story of Purim, not merely the first half. For this purpose the narrative portion of the β-text in chapter 9 is greatly abridged (as is most conveniently shown in Lagarde's edition), reduced to a few sentences giving only the facts which must in any case be stated. That which in the standard Greek occupies forty-seven verses has here fifteen. The official letters, on the contrary, are given in full (and somewhat freely reproduced), and because of the length of the king's letters the two versions appear to be of nearly the same length.

The new "Letter of Purim" thus constructed is indeed a curious document. One reason for the sparing use of narrative

in its construction may be seen in the fact that the one version contradicts the other, in details of some importance. The standard Greek, like the Hebrew, stresses the authority exercised by Esther, in the final adjustments; whatever is done is by her order or at her request. The king bestows upon Esther all of Haman's possessions (8: 1, in both Greek and Hebrew); it is she who thereupon gives Mordecai charge of Haman's house (vs. 2). It is Esther who, in a scene described at some length (vss. 3–8) obtains from the king the annulment of Haman's letter, and, more than this, the important permission to add to the letter whatever instructions she might wish, and to make use of the king's seal. She, then, was the savior of the Jews, and the real authority behind all that they proceeded to do on the 14th and 15th of Adar; though the letter was sent out, of course, in the name of Mordecai.

Contrast with this the ending of the folk-tale, translated above! The king gave Haman's estate to Mordecai, and at his request annulled Haman's letter. In putting the administration of affairs into Mordecai's hands, he made express mention of the debt which he owed to his Jewish subject, by whom his life had been saved. (This is a touch which we certainly should have expected from the original author of the story.) It is all Mordecai; and we are reminded of the earliest literary allusion to the feast, in 2 Macc. 15: 36, where it is called "*the day of Mordecai.*"

This is flat contradiction; but it could not have occurred to any Jewish editor to omit the troublesome ending or to alter it drastically; they did not work in that way. What was done was to append a few sentences dealing only with Esther and the king, giving in incredibly few words a summary of her great plan, and leading directly to the king's letter. The little transitional patch, verses 18–21, deserves study; it is a good example of editorial skill in preserving, and at the same time contradicting, the original text; it runs as follows:

On the next day Esther said to the king, Grant me authority to punish my enemies with death. Esther the queen also plead with the king in regard to the sons of Haman, that they might die with their father; and the king said, Let it be so. And they smote their

enemies in multitude. The king gave the queen his consent to have men slaughtered even in Susa; he also said, I permit you to have them [*the ten sons*] *hanged. And thus it was done. And he wrote the following letter.* (The letter is thereupon given, in a form evidently reproduced from memory and somewhat abridged.)

The presence of a strong literary motive in the Book of Esther has always been recognized, but the high degree of the writer's art shown in the construction of this gem of a short story has hardly been realized. Probably few who consider the matter will doubt that at least one version was planned to end at 8: 17 (α-text), the precise point where the tale comes to its conclusion. How significant this fact is, remains to be seen. In each of our three distinct versions of the book the historical element, as well as the literary, must be considered; and, as we have seen, at just the critical point in the α-version the two motives clash.

The Book of Esther, in every form known to us, sees in the story an important episode in Jewish history, and makes of it a document explaining the origin of the feast of Purim. The way in which this is effected in the α-Greek, by attaching a long ending and adopting the β-Greek as authoritative, has already been shown. But the latter version, which agrees in substance with the Hebrew, is itself in need of authentication. On general principles it is as possible to supplement a brief narrative as it is to abridge a long one; which was the process in the present case? The account of the danger and the deliverance, summarized in the preceding pages, had in it no hint of vengeance on the Gentiles and the massacre of them by thousands. The feast, on the contrary, commemorates the triumph of the Jews over their bitter enemies, a victory gained *by the sword* on a certain definite date, for there is to be an annual celebration. If this is the true climax of the Esther narrative, it is strange that the author made no preparation for it in the first seven chapters.

In the basal Story of Mordecai, Esther, the great king, and the villain Haman — the story just given in brief summary — there is indeed (in our present text) a day appointed, the day for the massacre of the Jews by Haman's order; but the mas-

sacre does not take place, the Jews are not molested, nothing happens on that particular date. The real turning point is the day when Esther faced the tyrant, or when sentence was pronounced against Haman; for the Story is one of deliverance, not of victory. The people in general had no active part in this turn of events, and there can hardly be long-enduring enthusiasm for the observance of a day on which something did *not* take place. Where, then, is the possibility of a great popular triumph, to be celebrated annually?

The answer given is ingenious, even if not quite plausible. It is assumed, though nothing of the sort has been said or implied in the Story, that the Gentiles of Ahasuerus' kingdom (which included all Western Asia and Egypt, "from India to Ethiopia") were deadly enemies of the Jews and eager for an opportunity to slaughter them. The Jews were "hated," everywhere (9: 2, 5, 16); and the Gentiles had made trouble for them, as appears from 8: 13, where the Jews are given permission "to avenge themselves on their enemies." They were foes of long standing, πάλαι καὶ νῦν δυσμενεῖς, 4: 18 (XIII, 7). Here were two great parties ready to fly at each other's throats — for it seems that the Jews were thoroughly armed; a sinister condition in a great empire, detrimental to every feature of the economic and social life. And because it was universal, not merely local, it must have been a subject of burning interest in every province.

Haman, it is to be observed, does not seem to be aware of this state of affairs. If he had been, he must have expressed himself differently, saying at least such things as Ahasuerus is made to say in the official letter (see XIII, 5, 7), instead of merely informing the king that "a certain people" had laws of their own, incongruous with the laws of the kingdom, making them undesirable citizens (3: 8) — not a word about long continued hostility and disorder. *According to the Story*, what came so near to bringing about a great massacre was *not* that the Jews were hated "from India to Ethiopia," but simply that Haman hated Mordecai.

From chapter 8 onward, however, the order for the pogrom still stands. Instead of countermanding it (as in the Story;

Esther *a*, 8: 16), the king gives the Jews permission to forestall the impending attack, taking the slaughter into their own hands. The fact that they meet with no serious opposition would seem to imply that their enemies had made no great preparation. But here, at all events, is the triumph to be celebrated, the victory, gained by the sword, in which all the people took part.

What seems to be the case is, that the popular narrative, which (in one version) ended with the execution of Haman and the elevation of Mordecai, has been adopted for a special purpose and built out in a new direction. There are many things, however, to be taken into account.

A pertinent question, quite distinct from the preceding, concerns *the name* of the festival, Purim. Whatever the origin of this word may be,[8] we are left in no doubt as to the meaning assigned to it. The *pūr* is the "lot," and the casting of the lot played so conspicuous a part in Haman's evil plan that the Jewish feast naturally received this name. How prominent is this motive in the Story?

In view of the facts just set forth, we should not be surprised to find Esther *a* containing no mention of day or lot, since neither the one nor the other had importance for the plot of the tale, which is told concisely. The query becomes more significant when it is applied to the first seven chapters of the Hebrew and the corresponding portion of the standard Greek. If the narrative of Purim is based on the folk-tale (as certainly appears, thus far, to be the case), the nature and amount of preparation for it are matters of interest, even if no new evidence is gained.

In the standard account, Greek and Hebrew, in the first seven chapters a single sentence (in 3: 7) tells that Haman cast the lot for the thirteenth (the Greek texts, "the fourteenth") of Adar.[9] The context in which the sentence occurs is the same in both versions, the *β*-Greek and the Hebrew.

[8] The literature of the subject is voluminous. It must suffice here to say that the standard textbooks of the present day and the principal commentaries are agreed in concluding that no satisfactory explanation of the word has yet been proposed.

[9] The Hebrew text is defective, having lost ten words necessary to the sense, pre-

Verse (6): Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus, even the people of Mordecai. (7) In the first month, which is the month Nisan, in the twelfth year of king Ahasuerus, they cast *pūr*, that is, the lot, before Haman, for one day after another and from month to month [to destroy in one day the people of Mordecai; and the lot fell on day thirteen of month] twelve, which is the month Adar. (8) And Haman said unto king Ahasuerus, There is a certain people scattered abroad, . . . etc.

Verse 7 might, or might not, be an interpolation. Its omission would leave no lacuna; on the other hand, if the casting of the lot to determine the fatal day was a feature of the original narrative, this was the place to introduce it. Only an accumulation of evidence, and that not merely textual, can decide the question. In the α-Greek the verse is obviously a later insertion, not only occupying a different place but also disturbing the original context. When vs. 13 proceeds: "And he hastened to deliver *it* into the hands of swift-riding horsemen," the reference is to the letter mentioned just before the interpolation but completely displaced and lost from sight by the account of Haman's going home to consult his gods and cast the lot!

In the α-Greek, the *day* seems to have had merely the following mention: Haman resolved to make an end of the whole Jewish people "in one day" (vs. 5, the frequently occurring Old Testament phrase), slaying them and taking the spoil. In the β-Greek, the reading is (vs. 13): "to destroy the race of the Jews in one day *of the twelfth month, which is Adar*, and to take their possessions as booty." The Hebrew has: "to destroy all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, in one day, *even upon the thirteenth day of the twelfth month, which is the month Adar*, and to take the spoil of them for a prey."

The conclusion, as regards the Story, is that it contained no mention of the casting of lots,[10] or of a definite date for the

---

served in the Greek and also in part in vs. 13. The copyist's eye caught the wrong group of letters. The accident is explained, and the original Hebrew text restored, in Our Translated Gospels, p. 160, where other similar cases in the Old Testament are mentioned; and (especially) the two important cases of such accidental omission in the Gospels, caused by the repetition of a group of Aramaic letters, are explained.

[10] An even more striking fact is the omission of any mention of the lot by Josephus,

proposed massacre. The fact also seems well established that the Story is faithfully preserved, in its main features, in the *α*-Greek. No ground has appeared for questioning the fact stated in our sources, that the feast received its name from the *pūr*, the lot, which was cast by Haman; but the clear evidence that this feature has been interpolated in the *α*-Greek, in the earlier chapters, while it appears only once, and that almost parenthetically, in the other texts, is certainly significant.

It is already clear that a fine bit of pure fiction has been fitted into a historical scheme. Much remains to be set forth in regard to the present form of the several documents, and especially as to the relation of the longer (Aramaic) version of the Esther narrative to the Hebrew version, the canonical book. It was remarked, above, that in literary quality the longer form is superior, and this is easily shown.

The difference in character between the Hebrew narrative of Esther and the "Greek" narrative is very great in more than one respect. What the differences signify, is a question not at once easy to answer. Leaving out of account, for the present, the matter of religious content, consider the book as a specimen of the historical novel.

The story, with its ingenious plot and dramatic situations, is first-rate in any form, but our two main versions show a sharp contrast in detail. The Hebrew is too sober, too condensed, to be exciting. Its hero and heroine are hardly human enough; neither is the king, though in an oriental tale a king can scarcely be required to show human qualities. The characters are merely stately, perfectly colorless. Esther, in particular, is a superior being equal to any situation, losing no time and wasting no words. If she has any of the emotions of an ordinary personage, the fact does not appear. In the Greek version, on the contrary, we see how a writer (whether the original or a later editor) could give the narrative human interest. Both the king and his

---

who writes out the Esther narrative (from the Greek) in full detail. Did Josephus (and his contemporaries) regard the derivation of *pūrīn, pūraiā*, from a word meaning "lot" as a fiction? How, otherwise, explain his rejection of the passages which make the assertion? The origin of the name of the festival was an important matter.

Jewish queen seem more like people of flesh and blood; even Mordecai comes in for a share.

Was Esther greatly disturbed, when she heard of the impending slaughter of her people, and of the desperate rôle she herself was called upon to play? The Hebrew does not say this, nor imply it. She gives instruction to Mordecai: "Gather the Jews of Susa, and fast three days for me; I and my maidens will do likewise. Then I will go in to the king and if I perish, I perish." That is all; and in what follows, in the Hebrew narrative, there is no sign of emotion, or of any distressing situation.[11]

On the third day, as the Hebrew tells the story, Esther arrays herself splendidly and stands at the entrance of the throne-room. The king sees her, and is pleased, and holds out the golden sceptre towards her. She advances and touches it. The king asks, "What wilt thou, queen Esther?" She replies, "Let the king and Haman come today to the banquet that I have prepared." They accept the invitation; and at the banquet the king asks again, "What is thy petition?" She answers, "Let the king and Haman come to the banquet tomorrow, and I will then make my request." This is all simple routine, with neither excitement nor suspense. There are no accompanying incidents. Esther knows what she wants, and gets it easily. The king enjoys the banquet, and Haman is flattered.

The Greek narrator sees the matter quite differently. When Esther heard the news of the pogrom which had been decreed, she went to her chamber "in the agony of death," and put on garments of the most abject mourning. Her prayer to the God of Israel for help follows. Thereafter, on the third day, she clothed herself magnificently, and took two maid-servants with her; the one, to lean upon, in the character of an elegant lady (ὡς τρυφερευομένη), the other, following behind, to carry her train. Her cheeks were flushed, her beauty at its height; the

[11] It might perhaps be objected, that strong emotion and a distressing situation are to be seen in 8: 3, where Esther is pictured as falling down at the feet of the king and beseeching him, with tears, not to carry out the purpose of Haman, to destroy all the Jews. But the shedding of tears, at this juncture, is merely an effective gesture, for the people of Esther and Mordecai are no longer in danger. The queen takes the course which she knows will bring the king *to her terms* with the least delay.

appearance of her face was joyous, but her heart was "contracted" with fear (ἀπεστενωμένη).

She passed through "all the doors" of the palace (her apprehension increasing with each door), and at last stood in the sight of the king. He was on his throne, in splendid array and with a most forbidding appearance. As he caught sight of her, his face took on a look of fierce anger. The color left her cheeks, and she fell, half fainting, "on the head" of her body-servant.

Then the king's anger was changed to concern. He came down hastily from his throne and supported her in his arms until she could stand upright, speaking to her reassuringly: "What is it, Esther? tell me; you shall not die; see!" and he rested the golden sceptre on her neck. She tried to answer, telling how his glory overcame her: "I saw you, my lord, as an angel of God"; and in saying this she fainted again, but was soon resuscitated.

Thereupon the story proceeds as in the Hebrew, excepting that at the point where the king promises to grant her any request, "to the half of the kingdom," the Greek gives her an "aside": she says to herself, "Today is my great day!"

Earlier in the story, there is in the Greek an embellishment which must not be overlooked. There was a plot against the king's life, eventually foiled by Mordecai, as is briefly narrated at the end of the second chapter. Two eunuchs, of the king's personal attendants, were in the conspiracy. When the matter came to light, they were tried and executed. Now according to at least one Greek version Haman, the king's favorite, was the real conspirator, the author of the plot. He is thus the villain of the great drama not merely because he is an enemy of the Jews, but also because he was seeking the life of the king! This adds considerably to the excitement of the scenes in which the king, Esther, and Haman appear together. Also, Haman's wrath against Mordecai was not only by reason of the Jew's contempt of him, but also (as the Greek, in both of its forms, expressly says) because he gave information against the two eunuchs.[12]

[12] This, of itself, would not suffice to prove Haman a conspirator. It is only in one of the later expansions of the Greek text, Addition E (XVI, 12), that the charge is

Another feature of the tale which at least one ancient narrator saw vividly in his imagination is the account of Mordecai's triumphal ride through the city, conducted by his arch-enemy Haman (6: 10 f.). Both the Hebrew and the standard Greek give the incident in the barest outline, as follows. The king commanded: "Take the apparel and the horse, and do to Mordecai as you have said." So Haman took the apparel and the horse, and arrayed Mordecai, and caused him to ride through the streets of the city.

The older Greek version (Esther α) puts life into the scene at its most interesting point. Haman approaches, in discomfiture, "the man whom he had planned to hang on that same day." He says to Mordecai, "Take off your sackcloth! (περιελοῦ τὸν σάκκον)." Mordecai, frightened, expecting foul play (ὡς ἀποθνήσκων), puts off the sackcloth, and then, in bewilderment, dons the splendid robe that Haman holds out to him. "He was thinking that he had a bad dream . . . he was speechless with amazement." Haman hurried him (ἔσπευσεν) on the back of the horse, and led him out into the street, and then through the city.

Is this, again, a bit of the original narrative? Possibly not; but the author of the whole brilliant scenario is more likely to have pictured this incident than any later *raconteur*, and he may be given the benefit of the doubt. It is worthy of notice that Josephus, when he comes to this point in his account (Antt. 11, vi, 10), reports that Mordecai, told to put off the sackcloth and don the fine robe, "thought it was mockery."

The foregoing comparison of the "Greek Esther" with the Hebrew has shown a wide difference between the two literary conceptions. On the one side, the concise and formal Hebrew record; on the other, the far more lively and interesting Aramaic narrative. In the question of priority, the balance continues to incline in favor of the Aramaic. Now that an

---

plainly made, in the king's letter: "He went about to deprive us of our kingdom and our life." The *motif* is too effective, however, to be denied to the original author of the Story.

accomplished story-teller is recognized, the probability that the Hebrew is an abridgment becomes very strong. (And, as has been indicated, if the Hebrew is known to be the later version, the features for which it has been blamed are seen in a new and far more favorable light.)

The recognition of "the Story" of Mordecai and Esther as a separate entity is of fundamental importance. Its original compass is very plainly delimited, its contents (irrespective of religious matter) corresponding to those of the first seven chapters of the Hebrew. All the rest — the material of chapters 8–10, the official letters, Mordecai's dream and its interpretation — has been borrowed from the standard Greek, with just enough verbal variation to obscure the unquestionable fact. The Story is certainly a survival from the original publication of the popular tale; it would be absurd to think of it in any other way. It is too perfect in form and contents to be a mere abridgment; and (much more important) no one who had ever heard the Esther story of our main documents could have made such an "excerpt" as this, flatly contradicting and spoiling the scene of Esther's triumph which stood out most vividly in every one's memory.

The material by which the Story has been expanded to the compass of our standard Greek is almost all originally Aramaic, as has been shown. This includes the account of the origin of Purim, and the "Additions" designated by the letters A and F (C and D were in the Story itself). The exception is formed by the Additions B and E, which never existed in Aramaic or Hebrew, but only in Greek. These will receive mention later.

We are so fortunate as to possess a written record in regard to the Greek version of the book of Esther, information the importance of which can only now be understood. At the end of the standard Greek text, in all MSS., there is the following note:

In the fourth year of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said that he was a priest and Levite, and his son Ptolemy, brought [*to Egypt*] *the above Letter of Puraia, as they termed it, saying*

that it had been translated [into Greek] by Lysimachus son of Ptolemy, residents of Jerusalem.[13]

The date here given is ambiguous, for "in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra" could apply to quite a number of Ptolemies. B. Jacob, in an article entitled "Das Buch Esther bei den LXX," in ZATW, Vol. X (1890), 274 ff., showed strong reasons for choosing the reign of Ptolemy Soter II (Lathyrus), whose fourth year would be 114 B.C.; and this date has been adopted, as seemingly the most probable, by many scholars. Others have preferred a still later date; thus Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das A.T., p. 648, would choose Ptolemy XIV, and the year 48 B.C. This might suit very well the traditional opinion of the Greek Esther as a translation of the Hebrew book, but in the light of the present study it is not acceptable. The date 114 B.C. appears to meet the requirements better than any other; indeed, to be the only one possible.

The designation of the (Aramaic) book as a "*letter* of Puraia" (or, as in some MSS., "Purīn") corresponds to that of the Hebrew book as *the "letter of Purim"* (9:29, compare vs. 26). The document, in whatever form, is thought of as a "festal" missive, setting forth the facts relating to the origin of the feast, and giving some prescription as to the manner of its celebration (see, for examples, the article, "The Letters Prefixed to Second Maccabees," in JAOS, LX (1940), pp. 119–122). The book of Esther has in fact the typical form of such a festal letter.

The knowledge that we have before us a Greek translation, made in Jerusalem in the second century B.C., from an Aramaic original, is a very great gain, and many important matters are now seen in a new light. From the Egyptian names of the translator and his associates, it may be conjectured with high

[13] The note, in slightly abbreviated and corrupted form, is found also at the end of a single MS. of the second Greek version, namely the Chigi MS. R, vi, 38, of the Vatican Library (19 of H. & P., h of Lagarde, b′ of the Cambridge LXX), evidently copied from MSS. of the standard text. The only feature of it deserving mention is the reading φρουραιηνα (!), combining both *Pūraiā* and *Pūrīn*, emphatic state and absolute state, respectively, of the Aramaic plural noun supposed to mean "lots." An interesting reading, attesting the use of more than one manuscript. The customary miswriting φρουρ- has already been explained.

probability that the version was made with the express purpose of providing the Egyptian Jews with this important document (the feast itself was of course already known to them). It may also be taken for granted that the best Aramaic text available in Jerusalem was employed, and that the work of translation was carefully done. The Greek indeed makes the impression, throughout, of being a faithful and skillful rendering. It shows plainly its Semitic origin, but reads smoothly. For all these reasons, our standard Greek version deserves to be regarded as a most important witness to the original form of the Esther narrative. It may even correct the Hebrew text at one or two points.

It must be borne in mind that *not all* of the Greek Esther is the result of translation. The Additions B and E (XIII, 1–7 and XVI, 1–24), purporting to give the text of the two official letters which are inserted in chapters 3 and 8, have been universally recognized as quite distinct, in style and literary quality, from the rest of the book. They are plainly the work of one and the same hand, and their pompous and inflated idiom is as far as possible from resembling any specimen of translation from Semitic. The modern reader is reminded of Jerome's remark in his Prologus Galeatus, where he contrasts the two books of Maccabees, as regards their idiom: *Secundus graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasi probari potest.* The two letters are composed in such Greek as was commonly written in Egypt in the second century B.C.; useful for comparison are 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, the Aristeas Letter, and the Ptolemaic papyri. They are inserted in the appropriate places, and fit the circumstances perfectly, showing thorough acquaintance with the narrative and undoubtedly representing the current interpretation. Their purpose, as has been generally recognized, is to give such official sanction — Gentile sanction — to the account of Mordecai and Esther as would make an impression in the lands of the Dispersion.

A plausible conjecture can be made as to the authorship of the letters. No other writer or editor would be as likely to insert these elaborate compositions in the narrative, in complete harmony with it *and in contexts apparently prepared for the*

insertions, as the translator himself under the circumstances described. Lysimachus son of Ptolemy, then, was probably both translator and editor, and we may recognize his own work in Additions B and E (XIII 1–7 and XVI 1–24).

We have need to ascertain just what it was that Dositheus and Ptolemy brought to Egypt. The Greek Esther has one conspicuous feature which appears neither in the Hebrew nor in Josephus (who, as already remarked, follows the Greek closely as a rule); this is the Dream of Mordecai. The account of the dream itself is given at the beginning of the book, while at the end, as the main feature of the last chapter, comes the interpretation. In both sections it is plain that the Greek is not the original language, but is the result of translation. This feature of the book, then, whatever its history, is at least ancient, but even the most superficial examination shows that it is an impossible intrusion.

The first comparison with the other version is decisive. In the Hebrew the successive scenes stand in the following order. 1. The royal feast, and the dismission of Vashti. 2. Mordecai is introduced, and his lineage is given. Esther enters the royal harem and is made queen. 3. The account of the two eunuchs who conspired against the life of the king. 4. Haman's proceedings against Mordecai and the Jewish people.

Now the Greek (= Aramaic) Esther has all this material, in practically the same form *and in the same order*, but not as its opening portion. The book begins with Mordecai, who is impressively introduced, and his lineage is given. There follows the principal feature of the chapter, the account of Mordecai's mystifying dream. Then comes the incident of the two eunuchs and their conspiracy; and this is followed by the introduction of Haman, with a single sentence telling of his intrigue.

After all this comes the material, described above, which forms the beginning of the Hebrew version. Thus Mordecai is introduced, and his lineage given, twice; Haman is similarly treated; and the incident of the two conspirators is recounted in two places. The fact that a different form of words is employed in each case does not render these repetitions any more tolerable. It is obvious that the Greek Esther has a false be-

ginning which in the main is mere duplication. It makes an impression like that which would be made by a man wearing two hats, one above the other. No attentive reader would suppose that the book was composed in this way.

Nevertheless, the account of the dream and its meaning, once presented, could hardly be dislodged. It was too interesting in itself, and too valuable as a record; must not Mordecai have been given such a warning?[14] His own account of the "two lots, one for the people of God and another for all the nations" (X, 10 f.) was too striking a feature of the symbolism of Purim to be thrown away. Also, the material bound up with the interpretation of the dream and sharing its fate — in short, the entire tenth chapter — is not all duplicated elsewhere and thus easily sacrificed.

It is plain to see why the expanded Aramaic version was such a fixture in the popular literature of Palestine that the Greek translators of 114 B.C. had no doubt as to its authority. Its chapter 10, however, stands or falls with its chapter 1, and together they form a false (though very early) appendage to the story of the origin of the Purim festival.

Chapter ten is a curious patchwork, quite worthless except for its connection with the first chapter, and spoiling what had been well planned.[15] The "festal letter" has an impressive close in 9: 27–31 (Hebrew, 9: 26–32). After this, only matter of evident importance for the main subject can be tolerated. *The dream* must now be interpreted, however, and it was necessary to devise some way of returning to Mordecai and his personal affairs. The manner chosen was as natural, and as brief, as any could have been. The greatness of Ahasuerus is again declared, this time in only two or three sentences. We are once more told that Mordecai had a share in the kingdom, and was held in great honor by his people. *This opens the way to the dream.* After Mordecai has finished with the interpreta-

[14] Eventually, after *this* dream had at length been discarded, it was replaced by another one of a different character and more elaborate, now familiar in the rabbinical literature. It is conveniently published in Ad. Merx's Chrestomathia Targumica.

[15] The author of the two chapters dealing with the dream was careless in writing "Media and Persia" in 10: 2, instead of "Persia and Media" as in 1: 3, 14, 18, 19. The latter order now expressed the historical situation, according to Dan. 8: 3.

tion, he discourses for a few sentences in general terms, and closes with a repetition of the date of Purim and the importance of its celebration; saying once more what had been said in the same form in chapter nine.

At this point (at F 10, or X, 13, or 9: 81)[16] the book ended which was translated from Aramaic to Greek at Jerusalem and brought to Egypt in the year 114 B.C. Upon its arrival there, the colophon was added which henceforth formed a part of the standard Greek text.

The early Jewish scholars who undertook to restore the original form of the Purim book, by cutting off the false head and the false tail of the literary monstrosity, were characteristically unwilling to abandon the first paragraph (verses 1–3) of the tenth chapter; a worthless patch, its purpose explained above, but not found elsewhere and seemingly not connected with Mordecai's dream. Josephus, who will have nothing to do with the dream, makes use of these three verses. *So also does our Hebrew book of Esther*, adopting them entire; one of the pieces of direct evidence which now begin to appear more plainly, showing that the Hebrew is derived from the Aramaic.

In 10: 2 we have an example of the stock phrase employed by the Jewish writers in bringing to an end the account of a royal reign: "The rest of the acts (of this king), are they not written (in such and such a book)?" Perhaps they were written, perhaps not, but the king is given the honor of the formula. Even Eissfeldt (Einleitung, p. 566) is inclined to believe in a real "book of the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia" (!), but it is merely the usual (and here very convenient) literary flourish.

An interesting example of the formula is the verse 1 Macc. 9: 22: "And the rest of the acts of Judas, and his wars, . . . and his greatness, they are not written, for they were exceeding many." The inevitable phrase ranks Judas with the kings of Israel, but the author knows that his own book has covered the ground sufficiently.

[16] It is to be hoped that before long there may be an end of this present confusion, due partly to the false theory of the book and partly to Jerome's disarrangement of the supposed "additions."

Almost universally misunderstood has been the passage which forms the close of First Maccabees: "And the rest of the acts of John, and of his wars, and of the valiant deeds which he did, and of the building of the walls which he built, and of his doings, behold, they are written in the chronicles of his high priesthood." This does not inform us that such a chronicle was actually in existence, it merely says that the glorious reign of Hyrcanus would certainly have one. Nor does it imply, as many commentators have too hastily concluded, that the reign had ended; on the contrary, the words could have been written at any time after the building of the wall which is mentioned. The most probable date for 1 Macc. is the middle of John's reign, about the year 125; see the Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. III, article "First Maccabees." This date will receive mention below.

In our Hebrew Esther, near the end of the ninth chapter, there is a phrase which has made great trouble; indeed, it has never had a satisfactory explanation. In 9: 29 there is mention of a "second letter of Purim." The phrase would be expected to mean the whole book of Esther, as we see it employed in the colophon of the Greek version; as Swete says in his Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p. 258, footnote 2: "The 'Letter of Purim' seems to be the book of Esther as a whole." The allusion in verse 29 was naturally mystifying, since no one imagined that our Hebrew Esther could be anything else than the original book. The "second letter" had almost as many explanations as there were commentators.

The phrase is found only in the Hebrew, but in a sentence which the Greek also has, in the same context, and which is given in almost the same words. The verse (9: 29) as it stands in the Greek text reads as follows: *καὶ ἔγραψεν Ἐσθὴρ ἡ βασίλισσα θυγάτηρ Ἀμιναδὰβ καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ Ἰουδαῖος ὅσα ἐποίησαν τό τε στερέωμα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῶν Φρουραΐα*, "and Esther the queen, the daughter of Aminadab, and Mordecai the Jew, wrote the things which they had done, and the confirmation of the letter of Puraia." According to the Hebrew text, the verse reads: "And Esther the queen, the daughter of Abihail, and Mordecai the Jew, wrote with all emphasis (?) to confirm *this second letter of Purim*" (אֵת אִגֶּרֶת הַפּוּרִים הַזֹּאת הַשֵּׁנִית).

The trouble which has been caused by "this second letter" may be seen illustrated in the following attempts at explanation.

Eduard Reuss, Das Alte Testament, Bd. VII (1894), p. 219, declares the word "second" in this passage unintelligible (*unverständlich*).

Wildeboer, in Marti's Hand-Commentar, suggested that the second letter "prescribed also a fast"; see vs. 31. But "*this* letter" cannot be made to refer to vs. 31, nor is the suggestion otherwise plausible; see below.

Siegfried, in Nowack's Handkommentar, wrote: The second letter was not directed to the Jews in general, but specifically to the Persian Jews. This does not appear, however, from the Hebrew text, nor has any other commentator found the explanation acceptable.

Paton, in his Book of Esther (Int. Crit. Comm.), thinks that the word "*this*" must be referred to the verses which follow, meaning the letter which Esther wrote. But the verses which follow have to do only with Mordecai's first letter, as will presently be shown.

Steuernagel, in Kautzsch's Heilige Schrift des A.T.[3], Bd. II (1910), p. 415, says that the word "second" can hardly be explained (*ist sachlich nicht recht zu erklären*), and believes the text of the verse corrupt.

Streane, in the Cambridge Bible (Esther, 1907), concludes: "The 'second letter' was a joint letter of Mordecai and Esther." But the Hebrew text does not say this; it says that they wrote "*to confirm* this (!) second letter."

Arnold Ehrlich, Randglossen, has a solution which has often been adopted by commentators in difficult passages; he writes: "Das Schlusswort [namely השנית, "the second"] ist mit anderen zu streichen."

Hoschander, The Book of Esther, p. 277, admits that 9:29 "is rather obscure," but has his own theory to account for the insistence of Mordecai and Esther. The Jews, he suggests, followed Mordecai's instruction and began to celebrate the day; as indeed is narrated in vs. 23, and also in vss. 26–28 ("because of all the words of this letter," vs. 26). Later, persuaded, or rather compelled, by "fierce opposition on the part of the Sopherim" (p. 280),[17] they ceased to observe the day. Hence (p. 281) "Mordecai and Esther had to combat the influence of the spiritual leaders of Israel . . . and in the end they prevailed." That anyone could suppose Esth. 9:29–31 to have been written during or after the serious controversy thus imagined is most remarkable.

What is more — and what no commentator or other interpreter of the book appears to have seen clearly and emphasized — is the fact that vs. 31 *brings nothing new*. It merely "confirms" the *first* letter of Purim, that is, vss. 20–22, and the things which the Jews "had ordained for themselves and their seed, the matters of the fastings and their cry (to heaven)," as

[17] It should be remarked that *this* conjecture of "opposition," which is derived solely from the *conjectured* breaking-off of the celebration, is thought to be given justification by a *third* conjecture (relating to the Persian calendar, see pp. 166–169) which is too obviously far-fetched to be considered seriously.

narrated in vs. 27, with reference also to the command in vs. 22 to observe the memorial *of their distress and their mourning*. It is, or should be, perfectly plain that verses 30 and 31 are in no sense an interpretation of vs. 29, but are merely parallel to it and independent of it, for Esther and Mordecai certainly did not "write to confirm" a confirmation!

What, then, is "THIS second letter"? The word הזאת necessarily points to something that is present and recognizable. There is one, and only one, obvious and certain interpretation, and that is, that the reference is to the present Hebrew book of Esther. It is a letter of Purim, exactly as the Greek book is styled, as has already been shown.

The *first* letter, the Aramaic compilation, had long been familiar to the people; any other version of the story must be acknowledged as secondary. Presumably the fact of the abridgment, and the important reason for it, were well known in Jerusalem. Mordecai and Esther could "confirm" in advance any official adaptation of the first letter — especially as the latter continued to be in existence.

The way in which this second letter of Purim, *the Hebrew book*, was made could hardly be any other way than by faithful translation from the best Aramaic text available. Examination shows clearly and unmistakably that this is what was done. Apart from the Aramaic words and grammatical forms which are universally recognized (and which might be present even in a late Hebrew composition), there are features of the literary style which constantly suggest the Aramaic idiom. Among these are: 1. The abrupt beginning of the sentence or paragraph, without the conjunction which is so characteristic of Hebrew, as in 2: 5, 10; 3: 15; 8: 16, etc. 2. The very frequent placing of the noun before the verb, as in 2: 13; 3: 15; 4: 1; 8: 15; 9: 18, etc., and the freer order of words in the sentence. 3. The remarkably frequent use of the *nif'al* and *pu'al* stems; this because of the extensive employment of the *'ith-* stems in any Aramaic composition. A writer of Hebrew would hardly have used the passive voice to such an extent. 4. The noticeable preference of the participial construction where the Hebrew style would naturally use a finite verb.

Aside from these features, which merely give a strong impression, there are to be seen examples of the slips and misunderstandings which are inevitable in any translation involving Semitic texts. Among them are highly interesting bits of evidence, some of them clearing up for the first time difficulties in the Hebrew which have had no satisfactory explanation.

It might be thought that the author of the Hebrew version of Esther, basing his work on the Aramaic text, would feel free to reshape the material of the story in some respects. This is not at all likely; the supposition finds support neither in Jewish literary history nor in the evidence furnished by the present case. Jewish authors and editors dealt faithfully with their sources in preserving the original text, even while correcting it; the evidence of this is abundant and unvarying.

This was believed to be an important chapter in Israelite history, and a valuable record; it existed in fixed and well known literary form, and had been translated into Greek. The editor, no less than the translator, had strong reason to stick to his original text. It was the easiest course, as well as the safest; and it was followed, the evidence shows very plainly, in turning the Aramaic text of Esther into Hebrew.

Abridgment was of course always permissible, while the unabridged original was still existent. In the present case, the omissions were of two classes: 1. the religious material (for the reason already given); 2. unnecessary scenes or details belonging to the Persian background of the story.

The following examples will serve to show the manner in which the Aramaic text was often followed word by word; very naturally, but sometimes too closely.

Among the few passages in the book of Esther which could be called really difficult of interpretation, there are two which stand alone. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 737, remarks: "Only two passages have become seriously corrupted in transmission (the last clauses of 1: 22; 7: 4)." As to the difficulty of the problems which they present there is general agreement; they have been variously guessed at, but never satisfactorily explained. In each of the two cases it is the underlying Aramaic text, too hastily transferred into Hebrew, that has made the trouble, as will now be shown.

In the latter part of the first chapter the king asks advice of his wise men

in regard to the punishment of the stubborn queen, who refused to obey the command of her husband.

One of the counsellors of the king advises him to depose Vashti, and to send out a letter into every part of the kingdom, making known the punishment of her disobedience. If he should not do this, he says, the princesses of Persia and Media will take their cue from the queen and give orders to their husbands; but the sending out of the royal decree will show them their place and teach them submission. The last verse of the chapter (1: 22) accordingly narrates that the king sent letters into all the provinces of his kingdom, to the effect "that every man should bear rule in his own house, *and should speak according to the tongue of his people.*"

The last clause is pure nonsense; every attempt to make something reasonable out of it has failed. It is generally admitted that there is some mistake in the text. The Hebrew reads: וּמְדַבֵּר כִּלְשׁוֹן עַמּוֹ; and from the requirement of the context, and the knowledge that an Aramaic text is being followed, it is evident that the main cause of the trouble is the participle מְדַבֵּר, *which in Aramaic means not "speak," but "rule."* The original text would seem to have been this: וּמְרַבֵּר כָּל לְשָׁן עַמֵּהּ, the decree of the king being "that a man should be chief in his own house, *and ruler over every tongue of his family.*" [18]

The question at issue, in the Medo-Persian kingdom, was one which has been heard in modern times: shall wives be allowed to talk back to their husbands? Vashti's offence had been more than simple disobedience; she had been free with her tongue. The Greek is fuller and more specific than the Hebrew; thus in verse 17, when the counsellor gives his advice to the king and the others, he recounts to them "the words of the queen, and *how she answered the king.*" See also 3: 1 (Greek). While Ahasuerus kept in mind the disobedience of Vashti, that which especially rankled in his memory was "what she had *said*"! So (verse 18) when the wives of the princes of Persia and Media hear "*the things which were said to the king by her,*" they will be emboldened to talk back to their lords.[19] On the contrary, the man of the house must exercise his authority over the tongues of his household. The reading כִּלְשׁוֹן (instead of כָּל לְשׁוֹן) in vs. 22 was evidently influenced by the כִּלְשׁוֹנוֹ just preceding.

It is possible that the Hebrew version was slightly abridged by its author in verses 17 and 18, omitting the clauses telling of Vashti's impudent replies to her lord; but far more likely that the Aramaic text which the editor had before him differed slightly at this point, as often elsewhere. This very popular story must have had several more or less different Aramaic forms. Certain it is that our verse 1: 22 was written by one who had the queen's tongue in mind.

The second of the two passages designated, 7: 4 (last clause), is a part of

[18] This very common use of the Aramaic verb has an interesting parallel in the Syr. version of 1 Tim. 3: 4, where the good bishop is described: "one that ruleth well his own house (וּמְדַבַּר בַּיְתֵהּ שַׁפִּיר), having his children in subjection," etc.

[19] The verb אמר in vs. 18 (Heb.) seems to have the meaning which is more common in Aramaic than in Hebrew, "speak with authority, give orders," etc.; compare the use in 2: 15, 20; 4: 13, 15.

Esther's reply to the king, at the final banquet at which Haman is accused. She knows Haman's plot and the terms of his offer to Ahasuerus. She tells the king that she and her people are appointed for slaughter, and adds: "If we had been sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I would have held my peace," כִּי אֵין הַצָּר שֹׁוֶה בְּנֶזֶק הַמֶּלֶךְ.

The last clause, as it stands, defies interpretation. It is needless to give examples of the principal attempts. The meaning of *nezeq ha-melek* is clear; it is the loss of the ten thousand talents, "about $18,000,000" (Pfeiffer), which the king's treasury would suffer, if Haman's plan should be frustrated. The insurmountable difficulty is in the word *ṣar*, "enemy," which can have no place in the clause. It is true that *ṣar* also means "distress," but it cannot be given that meaning here; the occurrence of אִישׁ צַר in the very next words of Esther (vs. 6) is decisive. All the ancient translators and interpreters see that the word in vs. 4 must mean "enemy, oppressor," and they render accordingly.

Here, again, the solution is given immediately by the Aramaic. הַצַּ֫ר exactly renders מְעִיקָא; but it is a false rendering, for it chooses the wrong word. No translator or interpreter could fail to see in the Aramaic word *at this point* the *af'el* participle of עִיק with the definite ending, "the oppressor." But it was in fact the feminine substantive, מְעִיקָא, מְעִיקְתָא, in the absolute state, meaning "distress." The rendering should have been: "For no distress (that we might suffer) could be compared with the loss to the king." This is not only a perfect solution, it is obviously the right one.

In this same verse, 7: 4, it is worthy of notice that the very common Aramaic particle אֲפִלּוּ has been taken over into the Hebrew text. It is found in one other place in the Hebrew Bible, namely Eccles. 6: 6.[20]

2: 13. An interesting example of a translator's almost inadvertent clinging to the original text, and of the manner in which a very common Aramaic adverb can be imitated in Hebrew, is furnished by the word (וּבָזֶה) which begins this verse. The long process of preparation of the candidates for the king's favor is being described. Each maiden is given a certain treatment for the first half-year, and another for the second half; and "*then*" (בָּזֶה, *bāzeh*), when the full time of her preparation is ended, she goes in to the king.

Now this word *bāzeh* is not correctly used in Hebrew to mean "then, thereupon"; in fact, there is no other known example of this use in all Hebrew literature.[21] It is not a logical meaning of the word. There seems, however, to be a very natural explanation of its employment here. The Greek has καὶ τότε, and it is safe to say that the Aramaic had בֵּאדַיִן (pronounced "*bēzain*"?). How might one be expected to render this into Hebrew? As soon as the ques-

[20] It will be remembered that the late Professor Burkitt was convinced that Ecclesiastes was originally Aramaic, and that our Hebrew is a translation. This may well be the case, though no adequate proof has been furnished.

[21] It is thus rendered, and entered as unique, in the standard Hebrew dictionaries: Gesenius-Buhl, Brown-Driver-Briggs, Siegfried-Stade, etc., and this interpretation is required by the Massoretic division of the verse. The rendering of Engl. R.V. is hardly defensible. *Bāzeh* could not mean "in this wise."

tion is asked, the justification of *bāzeh* appears; it could pass — it *has* passed — as an adverbial expression meaning "then."

4:3 and 5:12. In these two verses there is the very common Aramaic construction, the preposition *lamed* designating the agent, after a passive verb.

4:7 and 10:2. The word *pārāshā*, meaning "defining, specifying" (an amount, etc.), is found in Hebrew only in these two passages. It is the *pa'el* infinitive of the Aramaic verb, which has simply been transferred to the Hebrew text.

7:8. "They covered his face" has often been pronounced a false reading. It was Haman who covered his own face, in discomfiture and despair; cf. 6:12, also 2 Sam. 19:4, Targ. Gen. 4:5, and Targ. Esther I in this passage. The Greek has διετράπη τῷ προσώπῳ. See the discussion by Siegfried in Nowack's Handkommentar. There is no ground, however, for emending the Hebrew, which is simply a misinterpretation of the Aramaic, which must have been וַאַנְפֵי הָמָן אִתְחֲפִיאוּ, "and Haman's face was covered." So the Syriac reads.

9:19, 22. Another Aramaic infinitive, curiously made over into a mongrel Hebrew form, is מִשְׁלֹחַ, found only in these two passages. The Aram. form, *mishlach*, was taken over into the Heb. version under the influence of the *mishlōch* of Is. 11:14. The latter, however, is a *noun*; while the word in the above two passages is obviously the infinitive of the *qal* stem. This is an important example.

9:24. The כִּי at the beginning of the verse in the Hebrew text is a false and very disturbing translation of the Aramaic particle דִּי. The *Greek* translation of the Aramaic text rendered the particle correctly, by πῶς, for verses 24 and 25 give the substance of Mordecai's letter to his people. "The Jews received . . . what Mordecai had written to them, *how that* Haman . . ." etc. The Hebrew translator should have rendered by אֲשֶׁר; reading "for" or "because" spoils the whole passage.

9:25. Striking evidence of a somewhat mechanical transfer of Aramaic to Hebrew is afforded by the word וּבְבֹאָהּ (!) at the beginning of this verse. The feminine suffix is inadmissible here, if due attention is paid to the context. The preceding verse, from beginning to end, is concerned only with Haman, and vs. 25 also deals only with him and the king's judgment upon him. The Aramaic text of the verse began with the words ובמעלה קדם מלכא, "but when he (or she) came in before the king," etc., the Aramaic suffix being quite ambiguous in form. Both Esther and Haman came in to the king; which of the two should the translation designate? (for the Hebrew could *not* be ambiguous).[22] The Hebrew translator had his choice, and it was very natural indeed that he should have preferred the feminine suffix. Esther was the more important personage of the two. Here, again, the Greek gives the right interpretation, referring the suffixed pronoun to Haman.

This passage has made trouble from the earliest times to the present, and

[22] The English R.V. treats the feminine suffix as neuter: "when *the matter* came before the king"; but this is hardly Hebrew; and all the ancient versions, and the translation of the Jewish Publication Society, recognize that Esther is meant.

the importance of its testimony to the fact that our Hebrew Esther is translated from an Aramaic text must not be overlooked. The only source of the trouble is the feminine suffix, which the translators of the Hebrew (Targum, Latin, Syriac, Jewish Publication Society, etc.) are all obliged to explain, since the context calls for a masculine suffix! It is clear, as one reads the passage, that *no Hebrew author composing his own text* could possibly have written in this way. The explanation of the curious Hebrew is obvious to any one who has given close study to the translations (of whatever nature) made in this early period and in this part of the ancient world. There are perfect parallels in great number. The rendering (of these sacred texts) is always as nearly word for word as is practicable, and the translator likes to transfer what he sees before him. The evidence of this passage, especially when it is taken in connection with the other examples here joined to it, permits only one conclusion, the importance of which needs no emphasis.

While this or that detail must remain uncertain, the main results reached in this investigation are securely established, and will not be overthrown. The array of evidence from all sides tells its plain story. The earliest literature dealing with Esther of which we have knowledge was all Aramaic. The Greek versions known to us were rendered from that language. There was a primitive tale, which has been preserved, and on it as a basis the story of Purim was built. Our Hebrew book is an abbreviated translation from an Aramaic original.

The Egyptian translators of the "Letter of Puraia" certainly believed themselves to be rendering the original and authoritative text. Josephus used only the Aramaic version, in a Greek translation, and gave no evidence of acquaintance with a Hebrew version. Most significant of all, the Hebrew itself declares explicitly that it is the "*Second* Letter of Purim."

The time when this literary transformation was effected can be fixed within narrow limits, if the date conjectured for Jason's history (c. 130, see below) is adopted, for the document of Pūrīn must have been in circulation very soon after that date. Then, after only the briefest interval, before the document had had time to become well known, came the foolish addition of Mordecai's dream and its interpretation. No example of the unencumbered text remains. In the year 114, when the Egyptian translators made their Greek version in Jerusalem, the Dream was an accepted part of the record. So it was in the time of Josephus, 180 years later; so also when the Hebrew

translation from the Aramaic was made; though both Josephus and the Hebrew translator cut off (*almost* completely!) the disturbing accretions, at last recognized as such.

The date of the Hebrew edition seems plainly to be later than the time of Josephus. Because of the now customary manner of celebrating the feast, it was seen to be indispensable to make a concise revision. Every important feature of the Aramaic account was retained; one slight improvement was made, the insertion of the name "Hadassah" in 2: 7. In its now strangely unreligious form, though in fact deeply religious, the book was finally received into the canon of sacred scripture, after strong opposition,[23] in the second century A.D.

The literary history seems clear, in the main. According to 2 Macc. 15: 36, the *thirteenth* of Adar was Nicanor's Day, and the *fourteenth* was "the Day of Mordecai" (not, be it noted, "the first day of Purim," nor even of "the *days* of M."!). The year of the victory over Nicanor was 160; and, if the work of Jason of Cyrene was written at about the year 130, as seems most probable,[24] the celebration of this event had been continued longer than its minor importance would seem to warrant. As a purely secular festival, however, and a memorial of a victory of the Jews over their Gentile enemies, it was a thing

[23] The origin of the Hebrew version of Esther must have been well known to the Jewish scholars at the time when its divine authority was questioned. What part this fact may have played in the debate can only be conjectured. In later years the book was ranked high, as in the oft-quoted saying of Rabbi Simeon ben Lakish (c. 300 A.D.) placing Esther on a par with the Torah and above the Prophets and the Hagiographa. Maimonides, in the 12th century, said the same thing (Jewish Encyclopedia, X, 275). This is not mere reaction against the opposition to the book, as Wildeboer (Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament, p. 75) and others have held, but rather recognition of its high importance as the document of one of the great Jewish festivals.

[24] The literature of the Maccabean struggle, and of the independent Jewish state, was in the air in the latter part of the second century B.C. The friendly official Letter in Aramaic, 2 Macc. 1: 10–2: 18 (see JAOS, Vol. 60, 119–150), with its tone of authority, sent from Jerusalem to Egypt on the occasion of a Maccabean festival, is dated 124 B.C. Second Maccabees, which epitomized Jason's history, used the Letter as its introduction, and probably was written immediately or very soon after this date. Within a year or two of this time First Maccabees may be dated (see above). Jason's work, "in five books," has features which suggest a relatively early date. It shows no acquaintance with 1 Macc., nor does the author of the latter seem to know of Jason's history. Most probably they were written at about the same time, brought forth by the existing conditions.

not easily relinquished. An opportunity to improve upon it was seen and taken.

The Day of Mordecai, it seems clear, was derived from the original Story (see above), in which Mordecai was the central figure. The day which followed the Nicanor feast had very naturally been chosen for its observance, for the two days alike commemorated the triumph over Gentile foes. It was a time of warfare, of struggle against foreign oppressors, and patriotic feeling ran high. Neither day could be spared. In the improved calendar which included Purim, the double holiday was of course retained, but instead of Nicanor and Mordecai it was now Esther and Mordecai, and a "victory" in which *all* the Jewish people had taken part.

The way in which a brilliantly written short story was transformed into a document centering in two days of glorious butchery has already been indicated, perhaps sufficiently. The work of supplementing, with a minimum of alteration (a sentence or two inserted), was done very skilfully. The amount of imagined slaughter of the enemy gives no index of Jewish hatred of Gentiles; it simply was necessary to make the number of the slain high enough to comport with the greatness of Mordecai and Esther and the scale of the two-day celebration.

There remains the question of the date of *the Story*. Any time in the latter half of the third century or the first half of the second would be possible; most likely, however, it had not been long in circulation, nor become widely known, before it was expanded and transformed. The most probable date is the middle of the second century. From the two Greek versions, with the added help of the Hebrew, it should be possible to restore a text which could be regarded as the original. This notable specimen of the narrator's art deserves to be known in its primitive form and its true character.

NOTE ON MARK 6. 20

In the first part of this verse it is said that Herod feared John the Baptist, knowing him to be a just and holy man, and protected him; the second part presents some difficulties which can best be discussed with the text before us.[1] In the Textus Receptus the words are *καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίει, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.* The authorities for the words with which we are concerned are reported as follows from Legg's critical apparatus, somewhat abbreviated:

ηπορει και ℵ BLΘ Cop(bo), item *ηπορειτο και* W: *εποιει και* ACDNΠΣΦ 𝔎 Minusc. omn. Vss. pler.

The Authorized Version renders *πολλὰ ἐποίει* "he did many things," which is not only vague and virtually meaningless in itself, but also leaves the clause *καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν* rather purposeless, since it would have been enough to place *ἡδέως* before *ἀκούσας*. If that had been done and the sentence ended with *ἐποίει*, something, perhaps, could have been said for the opinion that *πολλὰ ἐποίει* means "Herod did many things that John recommended." As it is, that suggestion (Wohlenberg's) has met with little favor.

Almost all modern editors, and the revisers, adopt *πολλὰ ἠπόρει*. Klostermann is an exception; he prefers *πολλὰ ἐποίει* as the harder reading and follows Blass in treating those words as an "Uebersetzungssemitismus," the meaning of the clause being "he heard him often." Wellhausen also recognized that the words *ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίει* might be a Semitism, but rejected *ἐποίει* in favor of *ἠπόρει* because *καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν* becomes tautologous if *ἐποίει* is read. Klostermann would avoid the tautology by striking out the last clause as a gloss. Torrey, like Klostermann, rejects *ἠπόρει* as the easier reading. He regards *ἐποίει* as a translation of an Aramaic text which was corrupted in copying, and which he attempts to re-

[1] The works cited are as follows: Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium secundum Marcum, ed. S. C. E. Legg, Oxon. 1935; E. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium[2], 1926 (in Lietzmann, Handbuch zum N. T.); Blass-Debrunner, Gram. des neutestamentlichen Griechisch[5], § 414, 5; Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci[2], 1909; Torrey, The Four Gospels, 1933, 81 and 299; James Moffatt, The New Testament: a New Translation, 1913; Weymouth, The New Testament in Modern Speech[3], 1909; The Twentieth Century New Testament, 1899; Goodspeed, The Synoptic Gospels, 1930. Except where page or section numbers are given, the reference is to a note on Mark 6. 20 or a translation of that passage. The reference to Wohlenberg is at second hand, through Klostermann.

store. His version of the latter part of verse 20 is "and he treasured up many things which he heard from him, for he heard him gladly."

It is true that ἠπόρει seems at first glance to be an easier reading; but when we examine the translations we find that it is not without difficulty. The Revised Version reads "he was much perplexed; and he heard him gladly." More recent translators recognize a slight inconsistency between the two clauses, and treat the second as if it had been introduced by an adversative conjunction. Moffatt's rendering may be taken as typical: "he was greatly exercised when he listened to him, still he was glad to listen to him." Similar turns of expression are used by Weymouth, by the editors of the Twentieth Century New Testament, and by Goodspeed. But even after all proper allowance is made for the possibility that the writer may have neglected to make the relation of his two clauses entirely clear, it seems unnecessary here to force a clause introduced by καί into an adversative relation to the foregoing words.

A better version of the whole passage can be got by assigning to ἀπορεῖν a meaning that is well attested, yet strangely overlooked by all editors and translators known to me. Proceeding from "be at a loss," "be in doubt," this verb, when used in philosophical contexts, takes on the meaning "raise a question" in dialectic, especially a difficult and debatable one. The present passage may be rendered "after hearing him he was wont to raise many questions, and he took pleasure in hearing him." The last clause may imply that Herod liked to hear John's answers to the questions that he had raised, but that point need not be pressed. The picture of the half-Jewish, or Idumaean, king, with his veneer of Hellenistic culture, somewhat nervously practising his dialectic on the prophet of whom he stood in awe seems to fit this vivid narrative. Herod doubtless enjoyed John's sayings all the more for the complacent satisfaction that he took in his own ability to pose a question.

As to the evidence for ἀπορεῖν in this sense, examples of its occurrence with a question are fairly numerous; not to mention those listed in LSJ, it occurs so in Clem. Strom. 6. 96. 1 and Euseb. Praep. Evang. 1. 2 (p. 4d). With a direct (cognate) object it is apparently much less common; the following passages seem to justify the interpretation suggested for Mark 6. 20:

Arist. Metaph. 1085a 35: περὶ ὧν οὐθὲν ἧττον συμβαίνει τὰ αὐτὰ ἀπορεῖν.

Euseb. Praep. Evang. 1. 2 (p. 5c): ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἰκότως ἄν τις Ἑλλήνων . . . πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπορήσειεν.

The passive, which implies a transitive use of the active, is found in Clem. Strom. 6. 96. 1, ᾧ λόγῳ λύεται τὸ πρὸς τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἀπορούμενον ἡμῖν, πότερον τέλειος ἐπλάσθη ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἢ ἀτελής. It may also have stood in the Michigan papyrus of Hermas (Sim. 5. 4).

Wellhausen's observation (on 15. 3), that in Mark πολλά is almost always adverbial, is sound, but there are probable exceptions (5. 26, 8. 31); and it can hardly outweigh the advantages of the proposed interpretation. τοιαῦτα ἄλλα ποιεῖτε (7. 13) shows that the cognate object in the neuter plural is not alien to Mark's idiom.

A palaeographical consideration slightly favors ἠπόρει as the original reading. In some rather carelessly written papyri and on ostraka ρ is often written with so small a loop that it can scarcely be distinguished from ι; often only the context enables the reader to discriminate.[2] ἠπόρει, then, might easily become ἠποίει, and the familiar look of the last four letters would immediately prompt a copyist to write ἐποίει, particularly since he would probably know that illiterate writers sometimes tended to confuse η and ε, and would think that he was correcting an error of that kind. The reverse process of corruption is less likely to have taken place.

The relation between John and Herod reminds one — more strongly if the interpretation proposed above is right — of an ancient type that is widely distributed in popular literature. With a king is associated a wise man, who may be his teacher, a counsellor, a soothsayer, a prophet, or an inventor of new arts. His answers to the king's questions, or his advice about government, furnish the material for many kinds of stories. A. D. Nock has drawn my attention to a passage which shows that the Greeks had observed the frequent occurrence of the typical situation ([Plat.] Epist. 2, 310e–311b). Here, after the general remark, πέφυκε συνιέναι εἰς ταὐτὸν φρόνησίς τε καὶ δύναμις μεγάλη, καὶ ταῦτ' ἄλληλα ἀεὶ διώκει καὶ ζητεῖ καὶ συγγίγνεται, the writer goes on to mention the association of Periander and Thales, Pericles and Anaxagoras, Croesus and Solon, and others.[3] For ancient Egypt, Pharaoh and Joseph, Zoser and Imhotep seem to be cases in point; for Hellenistic Egypt it will suffice to refer to some remarks of Reitzenstein's in his Poimandres (123 f.). In religious literature the type is raised to a high level in the Buddhist work, The Questions of King

[2] This is a noticeable peculiarity of the Beatty-Michigan papyrus containing part of Enoch and Melito's Homily on the Passion; see my Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek, Introd., 13, and The Homily on the Passion by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, Introd. 9. For this feature of handwriting on ostraka my authority is H. C. Youtie.

[3] Cf. Cicero, De Off. 1. 155.

Milinda (Sacred Books of the East, XXXV–XXXVI). Folklore exhibits it in a degraded form in such stories as the King and the Herdboy (Grimm No. 152) or the King and the Clever Peasant Girl (No. 94).[4] In the folk-tales the King's questions usually degenerate into mere riddles or demand impossible feats, such as counting the drops in the sea; and the answers are often clever evasions or jests at the expense of the questioner. This last development is best known to English readers through the ballad of King John and the Bishop.[5]

Campbell Bonner

University of Michigan

[4] For the very numerous variations, see the Anmerkungen of Bolte and Polivka on these numbers.

[5] Child, English and Scottish Popular Ballads, No. 45 (I, 403 ff.).

QVISQVE SVOS PATIMVR MANES

Few passages of Virgil have led to the expending of more ink than the above (Aen. VI, 743), and, to my mind, it is seldom that a crux has less deserved the name. I wish to show that the sense is perfectly clear and ordinary Latin, observing a usual convention of verse, and further, that it was taken as such within about a century of Virgil's death, and that this continued to be the interpretation of the soundest exegetes, as it is now.

The meaning is nearly, but not quite, that suggested by the late W. Warde Fowler,[1] "Each individual of us must endure his own individual ghosthood." Not quite, for the individual ghosthood is not in point here, although it is of course true that by Virgil's day one could and commonly did speak of the *manes* of this or that person as well as of the *manes* in general, the "good folk" who live in the other world. That is to say, the word, being *plurale tantum*, had perforce to do duty as a singular also, when the greater stress laid in popular and philosophic thought on the individual made such a singular desirable. But Virgil's phrase does not derive through this comparatively new sense of the word, but through the old one, the undistinguished mass of the dwellers in the vague realm beyond the tomb. The derivation was perfectly simple, following a common license of Latin poetry, namely, that if the name of a place is scansionally inconvenient or does not exist at all, the name of its inhabitants may be used instead. Thus Horace, having no handy word to signify the Sabine country, *ager Sabinus*, treats *Sabini* as if it were the name of a place and says *in arduos tollor Sabinos*,[2] meaning, as everyone who has ever read the Odes knows, "I ascend into the mountainous Sabine territory," "I mount the Sabine hills." When so used, the word may, as it does in Horace, take an adjective which would make poor sense or none if the literal significance were present. The Sabines were a sturdy folk, but not particularly tall, certainly not so tall that fat little Horace had to climb to get at one of them. This transferred meaning is precisely what we find in Virgil, with the same use of an adjective appropriate to it, but not to the literal sense, and the same

[1] W. Warde Fowler, Religious Experience of the Roman People, London, 1911, p. 386.

[2] Horace, C. III, 4, 21–22.

reason for employing a *translatio*. There was no good Latin word then in use (whatever *Orcus* may once have meant)[3] which signified the place or the life of the dead. This being so, Virgil must needs use, if he wanted to speak plainly and avoid periphrases like those in lines 127, 134, 140, 154 and elsewhere of the same book, the word which signified the dwellers in the other world. He must, that is, say "ghosts" for "ghost-land." That enabled him to use *suos* with it and make excellent sense, which, I fancy, it did not occur to him that anyone would miss. Nobody owns the ghosts in general, unless it be Pluto or some such deity, and even he rather rules them, and no one suffers his own ghost; he is that ghost, once he is dead. But he can endure his own ghost-land; his other world is what he has made it by his conduct upon earth, while the next spirit's Hades may be quite different. In like manner, it is *sopor suus* which holds tired bees asleep in the night;[4] sleep, in itself, is one, but every sleeping thing has a share of, or form of it, differing from the next creature's.

That this was the way a learned and poetically-minded Latin of the early Empire understood the passage is very clear, I think, from a passage in Statius which it was once the fashion to cite, and now it is the fashion to replace by mere borrowings of Virgil's phrase by Christian poets. At all events, I find it cited (in the Leiden edition of 1680, apud Jacobum Hackium) by Emmenius, who misunderstands it, in Forbiger's edition and, quoted from Bauer, in Arnold's (London, 1845), together with Bauer's correct interpretation of Virgil, "patimur suos quisque Manes, i.e. suos quisque Inferos, suum ἄδην." But it is not in Conington, in Mackail, in the admirable edition of Book VI by Norden, who (p. 33) actually advises his readers "griechisch zu denken" in this typically Latin passage, in Butler's good though less learned commentary nor in Marbach (Pauly-Wiss.-Kroll, XIV, 1057). Heyne has it in a note which some later scholars might ponder with profit, though it has its faults and does not make enough of Statius' words.

Statius, then, is describing the descent of Amphiaraos into the lower world. Pluto is much perturbed, and fears an incursion into his realm by the celestial gods. From his throne he addresses the newcomer;[5]

> At tibi quos, inquit, manes, qui limite praeceps
> non licito per inane ruis?

[3] See, for an ingenious suggestion, which, right or wrong, has nothing to do with Virgil's use of *Orcus*, H. Wagenvoort in S.M.S.R., xiv (1938), p. 33 sqq.

[4] Georg. iv, 190.

[5] Statius, Theb., VIII, 84.

Statius' scholiast sees very well that Virgil is imitated, and himself imitates Virgil's commentators. He says:

QVOS INQVIT MANES pro poenis posuit. id est: quos cruciatus patieris? ut Virgilius 'quisque suos patimur manes.' manes ergo ideo dicti sunt quia damnati aeterna apud inferos poena permanent.

His etymology need not detain us; we shall see presently that he got *pro poenis* out of Servius. It is inapplicable here, for surely Pluto means nothing more not less than "What fate in the lower world (shall I give) thee?" In other words, Statius understood this part of the *diuina Aeneis* [6] exactly as I do, and in so taking it, there can be little doubt that he followed the best Virgilian scholarship of his day. He was a scholar-poet, the son of a scholar-poet, and although neither father nor son reached the first rank in learning or in literature, their opinion about the meaning of a passage in Virgil is entitled to as much respect as, say, that of Miss Sitwell concerning some lines of Pope. There is room, and I have some hopes that a more accomplished hand than mine will undertake it, for an essay on Virgilian interpretations in Statius generally; at present I am concerned with this one.

It remains now to show that "Servius" understood the passage as Statius had done. He says, briefly,

QVISQVE SVOS PATIMVR MANES supplicia quae sunt apud manes, ut si quis dicat 'iudicium patimur' et significet ea quae in iudicio continentur.

This is no place to discuss the complicated question of who "Servius" and "Servius auctus" are. Whoever gave the two commentaries the form they have in our MSS., there can be no doubt that they represent the resultant of several centuries of annotating, additional annotating, excerpting and abbreviating. On this particular passage we have two notes, both credited to Servius, one that just quoted and another, beginning *est et aliud uerius*, which is a piece of late fantasy, to the effect that by *manes* Virgil really means the good and evil daimones (*genii*) which, in some forms of the belief in a personal daimon (approximately the guardian angel of Christian theology) everyone has.[7] Heyne, in the note already quoted, rightly dismisses it as not germane

[6] Theb., XII, 816.

[7] See Th. Hopfner, Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber (Wessley, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, XXI), Leipzig, 1921–1924, Vol. I, p. 27. He would trace this note to a combination of the idea of the daimon in Plato with "die volkstümliche Auffassung von zwei Daemonen, einem guten und einem bösen." Be that as it may, it is wholly un-Virgilian in doctrine. For the real and normal relation, in all good Latin, of *genius* to *manes*, see the facts in the Thesaurus, VI, 1834, 38 sqq.

to Virgil's words. He was a good enough Latinist to realize, what some moderns overlook, that in the age of Augustus *manes* and *genius* were terms whose meaning nowhere overlapped. This note, then, is a piece of later speculation, neo-Platonic if we like to call it so, which has found its way into Virgilian exegesis as so much of which the writers of the Old and New Testaments had never heard has got into Biblical expositions. Returning to the note already quoted in full, we see that the commentator has hold of the right fundamental idea; *manes* is practically the name of a place and the soul endures what it finds there. Now the place of souls which Virgil is discussing is what a terminology later than his called Purgatory; the dead stay there

> donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,
> concretam exemit labem purumque reliquit
> aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem.[8]

What the soul finds there is thus remedial punishment (*exercentur poenis*, 739), and so it is a legitimate, though rather obscurely brief, way of explaining what the poet means to say that *manes* is here the same as *supplicia quae sunt apud manes*. That is to say, Servius also understands the phrase *suos manes* as meaning "his own share in the underworld," though he applied his knowledge differently, to the exposition of the old poem and not the creation of a telling locution in a new one. One or two later poets, as Ausonius with his *patiturque suos mens saucia manes*,[9] merely quote Virgil and expect their readers to remember the comment of Servius or a forerunner of his.

This seems to me indication enough of how the passage was taken by the main stream of criticism in antiquity. I end by reaffirming that I think Virgil's expression clear and even conventional (for Virgil), and add that I doubt if it ever would have been thought difficult had not the incautious been misled by the fanciful equation, due to some unknown ancient of mystical tastes, of *manes* with *genius*.

H. J. Rose

St. Andrews University

[8] Virg., Aen. VI, 745–747. I do not discuss the vexed question of the order of lines 743–747.

[9] Ausonius, II, 103 Peiper.

SOME REMARKS ON THE EVASION OF THE USURY LAWS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

The device of using a Christian straw man as an intermediary, for the purpose of evading the usury laws, which is mentioned in the three thirteenth century Hebrew documents quoted in Heichelheim's article,[1] also appears in a case decided by the Court of The Exchequer of The Jews in 1272.[2] In this case a Jew borrowed money from another Jew at interest, using the above device, and gave the creditor a mortgage on a certain house as security for the debt. The debtor then sold the mortgaged house to a Christian. Upon default by the debtor the creditor sought to recover the debt from the mortgaged property which was then in the hands of the Christian purchaser. The case is interesting because the court refused to be misled by the evasive practice and adjudged the transaction usurious, and also because of the insight it affords into the working of the medieval mind with regard to the question of usury. An English court, consisting of Christian judges, apparently held that although it was permissible for a Jew to take usury from a Christian, it was unlawful for him to take usury from another Jew.

The question of the usurious character of the transaction between the two Jews came up in the following manner. The Christian defendant, the purchaser of the mortgaged property, pleaded, among other things, that the bond under which the Jew sought to recover his debt was void, because "according to the Statutes of Jewry Jew ought not to take usury from Jew, in like manner as according to the law of the Land Christian may not take usury from Christian." The Jew answered this plea by saying that "though in the said starr it is contained, that, if Diaia do not pay the said £12 at the term aforesaid, he may take usury therefor, to wit, 2d. a pound a week, by a Christian hand, if this seem to the said Prior to be unjust to him, let him go before the Masters of his Law in chapter, and implead him there, because matters of this sort touching his Law ought not to be corrected elsewhere." The court, however, held that, "because usury is contained in the said starr, and is against the Assize of Jewry . . . it is adjudged that the said Prior be quit of the said debt, and that the said house, which belonged to the said Prior and the said Diaia be not charged with the said debt."

[1] H. T. R., v. XXXV, pp. 39–42.

[2] Select Pleas, Starrs and Other Records from The Rolls of The Exchequer of The Jews, Selden Society Publications, v. 15, p. 65 f.

As to Heichelheim's contention that the above device represents "postpayment of interest as a penalty," similar to the method employed in the documents from Hellenistic Egypt which he discusses in his article, it seems to the writer that it is based on a misconception of the nature of this device. Heichelheim apparently thinks that under this device the Jewish borrower paid the interest to a Christian intermediary who, after deducting part of the payment as compensation for his services, turned the balance over to the Jewish lender. In a note to his article he quotes from an unpublished lecture by Professor Marmorstein as follows:

> "A Jew, Jacob ben Eliab, borrowed 60 shillings from his brother Solomon and promised to repay the sum before Easter 1254. The loan was originally without interest; yet, in case of default within a calendar-year, Jacob, the debtor, undertakes to pay two pennies per month for each pound to a certain gentile, who steps in the place of the Jewish creditor. It is easy to imagine or visualize what happened. The debtor pays the interest weekly or monthly to the gentile, who after some deduction for his trouble delivers the rest to the Jewish creditor."

It seems, however, that Heichelheim's and Marmorstein's interpretation of the legal fiction involved in this device is not entirely correct. In the first place, let us analyze the legal relationship between the principal parties and the Christian intermediary, and see where this will lead us under their interpretation. The documents clearly establish the fact that the creditor-debtor relationship was created between the two Jews, that is, between the actual lender and borrower, and not between the Jewish borrower and the Christian intermediary, since the obligation of the bond runs from Jew to Jew, and not from Jew to Christian. What, then, was the nature of the supposed payments by the borrower to the Christian intermediary, if such payments were made, as Marmorstein would have us believe? Were they interest payments? Apparently they were not, since the Christian was not the Jew's creditor. They must have been gratuities. They could not possibly have been anything else, since the Jew owed nothing to the Christian to whom these payments were supposedly made. The agreement between the two Jews must therefore be read in something like the following manner. The borrower said to the lender: I promise to repay you the loan upon such a day, and if I do not repay you on that day, I shall be bound to make certain gratuities to some Christian every week and to see to it that these gratuities are turned over to you. This, the writer submits, makes no sense, and cannot be dignified with the name of a legal fiction. It is the very

essence of a legal fiction that, while doing violence to substance, it adheres strictly to form, and in this crude scheme the writer fails to perceive any form which will stand the test of even the simplest logical analysis.

Secondly, the documents speak of the lender, not the borrower, borrowing money at interest 'by Christian hand.' Thus in the case cited above from The Select Pleas the bond reads in part as follows: "Diei, le Evesk', Judeus, recognovit per starrum suum, quod tenetur Abrahe, filio Joscei, de Eboraco, in XIIL sterlingorum . . . et si dictum terminum transierit dicto Abrahe licebit mutuo accipere dictos denarios per mannum alicujus Christiani ad usuram." It was Abraham, the lender, and not Diei, the borrower, who was to borrow money at interest, so that if interest payments were to be made to the Christian intermediary they must have been made by the former and not by the latter.

At this point the writer feels that the whole picture has become so confused that the reader may fear he will never be able to work his way through this maze of legal technicalities. In order to allay such fears on the part of the reader the writer will at once give what he believes to be the true meaning of the device which is quite simple, if properly understood.

The borrower said to the lender: If I do not repay you the loan at the time fixed in my bond, you may borrow the money, through the mediation of a Christian, at interest at my expense, and I will reimburse you to the full extent of the interest you may have to pay by reason of my failure to make timely payment. At the expiration of the term fixed in the bond, which term was fictitious, the parties never intending that payment be made on time, the Jewish lender would proceed to make a friendly arrangement with another Jew who would supposedly make a loan of an amount equal to the amount of the original loan to a Christian at interest. The Christian, in his turn, would loan the money to the original Jewish lender.[3] These loans, by the accommodating Jew to the Christian and by the Christian to the original Jewish lender, were, of course, fictitious. But ostensibly the latter had to pay interest to the Christian, and was entitled to reim-

[3] Such interest bearing loans by Jew to Jew through the mediation of a Christian were held by Rabbi Jacob of Rumerupt, the great French Tosafist known as Rabbenu Tam, to be permissible. See Tosafot on Baba Mezia, fol. 71b, s.v. K'gon. This holding was by no means unchallenged. See Sulḥan 'Aruk, Yoreh De 'ah, ch. 168, sec. 7 and authorities there cited. But the great authority of Rabbenu Tam among the English Jews, who were under the religious influence of their brethren from across the Channel, was apparently sufficient for them to consider such loans lawful.

bursement by the original borrower. The sin of usury was thus avoided. The borrower did not pay interest to the lender; he only paid him the expenses he incurred by reason of his default.

This interpretation of the meaning of the device is entirely borne out by the texts of the documents quoted in Heichelheim's article. Loewe's translation of the interest clause in these documents reads as follows: "And if the aforesaid time shall have passed without payment (having been made) to his brother R. Solomon of the aforesaid debt, R. Jacob empowers him to regard the sixty shillings owing to him (as borrowed) by the agency of a non-Jew." And in parentheses he adds: "Literally, to borrow the sixty denarim on his account through the mediation of a gentile." What his authority for this free translation of the text was the writer does not know, but he ventures the guess that Lowe did not fully understand the nature of the device, and that therefore he tried to read into the text something which was not there. The literal translation is the correct one. The lender was to borrow the money, through the mediation of a Christian, at interest at the borrower's expense.

The true nature of the device appears most clearly in another Hebrew bond [4] from Angevin England, not mentioned in Heichelheim's article. The interest clause in this bond reads as follows: "And the said R. Yechiel shall be believed, if he should claim to have borrowed the said money through a gentile at usury. And the said R. Abraham shall be bound to reimburse him or his assign as to principal and interest which may accrue by reason of his failure to make timely payment." The language of this clause is clear and unmistakable. Interest was to be paid under it, as under the clause in the bonds quoted by Heichelheim, in the form of damages and expenses.

It is to be noted here that the device of disguising interest payments under the form of damages and expenses was used extensively by Jews and non-Jews alike, and that it undoubtedly originated with the Jews.[5] The borrower would bind himself to pay to the lender his

[4] Davis, Hebrew Deeds (Shtaroth), No. 83.

[5] There is in the Hebrew law of evidence a whole branch known as 'ne'emanut' or credence. The principle upon which this branch of the law is based is, that the parties to a transaction may regulate in advance the rules of evidence which are to govern any litigation which may arise in the future out of that transaction. This principle goes back to the Mishnah, Ketubot, 9, 5, where the rule is laid down that if a husband, at the time he endowed his wife, stipulated in writing that he is to have no claim upon her for 'either vow or oath,' he will have no such claim upon her, although ordinarily a woman who demands her dower must state under oath that she has nothing of what belonged to her husband in her possession. For a further elaboration of this principle

damages and expenses in case of default, adding that as to the amount of these damages and expenses the lender shall be believed on his simple word or, sometimes, on his oath. To cite just a few typical examples of such clauses. "Super quibus expensis factis et dampnis sustentis creditur simplici verbo dicti domini Philippi." [6] "Quod idem Cressus vel attornatus suus super dampnis suis et expensis supradictis simplici sua assercione, sine juramento vel alterius onere probacionis, creditur." [7] "For which damages their oath, touching the Five Books of Moses, shall be credited without the burden of other proof." [8] "Nus sumes tenuz . . . de rendre et restorer totes ses pertes et ses dommages et ses emplits perduz par son simple dit." [9]

Thus it appears from the foregoing discussion that there is very little similarity between the Hebrew bonds from Angevin England and those from Hellenistic Egypt, for it is obvious that a provision

---

see Talmud, Shebu'ot, fol. 42a, Maimonides, Yad ha-Ḥazakah, Malveh, ch. 15, and Shulḥan 'Aruk, Hoshen Mishpat, ch. 71. Obviously, such a principle has wide possibilities. It was, indeed, used by Jewish creditors throughout the Middle Ages for the purpose of strengthening their position as litigants in various ways. It was also seized upon by money-lenders to provide them with a convenient means of evading the strict Pentateuchal usury laws. The clauses quoted in the text are examples of such use of this principle. Note particularly the expression 'free of vow and free of oath' which is clearly an allusion to the Mishnah in Ketubot cited above. In fact, the very same expression is used in the Talmud, Ketubot, fol. 87a, in the discussion which follows that Mishnah. Pollock and Maitland, who mention this device in their History of English Law, v. II, p. 225 (2nd edition), were unaware of its Hebrew origin.

It should be noted here that a stipulation to the effect that the wife, when claiming her dower, is to be free from any oath is also found in the Demotic marriage settlement of the later Ptolemaic type. This stipulation reads: "I shall not be able to require an oath from thee in the house of judgment on account of the right of thy woman's property above (named), saying 'thou didst not bring them to my house in thy hand.'" Adler Dem. 14 and Ryl. 16. As between the Mishnah in Kethuboth, mentioned above, and the Demotic marriage settlement it is, of course, difficult to determine who borrowed from whom. But the phrase "in the house of judgment," which occurs in the Demotic documents and which is strikingly similar to the Hebrew "beth-din" furnishes, perhaps, a clue. See also Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, 14, where reference is made to an oath by a woman in an action of separation or divorce in which she claimed her dower. Cowley remarks that the object of the oath is not known. It seems, however, that the above stipulation in the Demotic marriage settlement and in the Mishnah make its object sufficiently clear.

[6] Calendar of The Close Rolls, 1268–72, p. 300.

[7] Select Pleas etc. from The Exchequer of The Jews, p. 94.

[8] Calendar of The Plea Rolls of The Exchequer of The Jews, v. III, p. 297.

[9] Calendar of The Close Rolls, 1268–72, p. 243. See also pp. 292, 410–411, 1254–1256, p. 378–379; Calendar etc. of The Exchequer of The Jews, v. III, pp. 53, 105, 128, 200, 307; Pollock and Maitland op. et loc. cit. and documents there cited.

for a penalty is not to be likened to one for compensation for damages suffered and expenses incurred.

There is, however, ample evidence elsewhere that provisions for penalties, identical with those found in the Hellenistic documents which Heichelheim discusses in his article, were used by the Jews in the Middle Ages for the purpose of evading the usury laws. In a responsum [10] by Rabbi Solomon ben Adret (1235–1310), a leading authority of Barcelona, we find it stated: "Regarding the question you asked about the bonds in which it is customary to write that if the debtor fail to pay on the due date, he is to pay an additional sum by way of penalty." קנס The learned rabbi in his opinion then proceeds to state that although the practice is reprehensible, since it is clearly an attempt to evade the law, it cannot be said to come within the prohibition of the law. The device is also mentioned in the Sefer ha-Terumot [11] by Rabbi Samuel ha-Sardi (13th century, Spain). It is also incorporated in the Shulḥan 'Aruk,[12] the standard code of Hebrew law, where it is condemned as an evasion of the law.

There is also evidence that this practice was resorted to by the Jews of medieval England in their dealings with Christians, and that it was adopted by Christian money-lenders and used by them even after the expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290. In the Close Rolls of Henry III and Edward I there are numerous entries [13] in which royal equity is exercised in favor of Christian debtors, relieving them from 'penalties and usuries' which they owed to the Jews. And in a case decided in 1314 we find the following: "Note that if I be bound to one in the sum of £20 upon the condition that if I do not pay the £20 by a certain day, I shall then be bound in £40, and if I do not pay the £20 by the day assigned, yet shall not the other ever be entitled to demand the £40; for it would be usury." [14]

[10] Responsa of Rabbi Solomon ben Adret, No. 651 (Vienna, 1812).

[11] Chapter 46, subdiv. 4, sec. 32 (Zolkiew, 1808).

[12] Yoreh De 'ah, ch. 177, sec. 14.

[13] See e.g. 1264–1268, pp. 265–266, 305, 403; 1272–1279, pp. 177, 271, 286.

[14] Eyre of Kent, 6 and 7 Edw. II, v. II, p. 27, Selden Society Publ., v. 27.

A provision for the payment of interest in the form of a penalty for default is also found in a large number of Assyrian deeds. See Johns, Assyrian Deeds, vol. 3, sec. 401 f. In most of these transactions the loan was made for a short term without interest, with a provision that if the borrower failed to pay the debt on the due date, the amount of the loan was to be increased by one-quarter thereof. Johns is of the opinion that the one-quarter represented the monthly interest rate which the borrower was to pay from the time of default, so that the loan was to bear interest at the rate of 300% per annum. Kohler and Ungnad in Assyrische Rechtsurkunden, p. 460, maintain, on

Regarding the point at issue between Heichelheim and Tscherikower, namely, whether or not the fact that Horus and his family 'receive and give loans only without interest,' but with a stipulation for a penalty in case of default, is indicative of Jewish influence, the writer is inclined to agree with Heichelheim's conclusion. Tscherikow-

---

the other hand, that the one-quarter represented the yearly interest rate. There are, however, great difficulties in either view. As to Johns' view the main difficulty is that an interest rate of 300% per annum is entirely too high, even according to the standards of oriental money-lenders. Moreover, there are some documents in which the rate of increase is specified at one-third (Johns, Nos. 40, 43, 57, corresponding to Kohler and Ungnad, Nos. 293, 281, 263), others where it is stated to be one-half (Johns, Nos. 15, 18, 33, 34, 50, 129, 132, 133, 147, 148, 149; Kohler and Ungnad, 260, 270, 291, 264, 301, 313, 311, 307, 324, 325, 309), and still others where it is set at an amount fully equal to the amount of the principal. (See Kohler and Ungnad, op. et loc. cit.) If Johns' view should be accepted, we would have in these cases interest running at 400%, 600%, and 1200%, respectively, per annum, an altogether incredible rate, particularly when we take into account the fact that when a monthly rate of interest is expressly provided for in these documents it usually runs between 20% and 40% per annum, and that only in one case does it go up as high as 160%. (See Kohler and Ungnad, op. et loc. cit.)

The difficulty with Kohler and Ungnad's view is that in ancient times, as well as throughout the Middle Ages, interest was never computed on a yearly basis. There were several reasons for this. Chief among these were: 1. The computation of interest on a yearly basis would have accentuated the ruinous effect of usury upon the borrower, whereas the computation on a monthly basis made the transaction more palatable to him. 2. In cases where the borrower wanted to repay the loan in the middle of any one year from the time he borrowed, the money interest would have to be prorated, which would have been quite a complicated procedure in ancient times, and in the absence of a specific provision in the loan agreement might have given rise to controversies between borrower and lender. 3. In the case of an Assyrian money-lender the computation of interest on a yearly basis would sometimes have caused him the loss of a full month's interest, since the Assyrian year sometimes consisted of thirteen, instead of the usual twelve, months.

In view of all this the writer believes that the provision that in case of default the amount of the loan is to be increased by one-quarter merely means what it says, namely, that immediately upon default, and not after the lapse of a month, according to Johns, or a year, according to Kohler and Ungnad, a penalty of one-quarter of the amount of the loan became due, in the same manner as in the medieval documents and the Egyptian papyri of the second century B.C., mentioned in the text. In other words, the one-quarter was not an interest rate, per month or per year, but a penalty in a single sum to become due at once after default.

As to the reason why the Assyrian loans discussed above were originally made without interest Johns offers an explanation which, in the writer's opinion, does not quite fit the facts. According to Johns these loans were made by landlords to their crop-sharing tenants as advances for the purpose of buying seed for the fields or food for the reapers. In section 399 he says: "These loans were usually meant to be without

er's contention that the device was non-Jewish in origin, and that it was evolved for the purpose of evading the limitation upon the rate of interest which could be legally charged at that time in Egypt fails to carry conviction for this reason. If the penalty had been intended solely to bring to the lender a higher rate of interest than the one he

---

interest until such a time as they might reasonably be expected to be repaid. The interests set down as to be charged were rather to ensure attention to business, than a genuine business profit. They were a species of insurance against risk from negligence or incompetency."

There is, however, at least one document in Johns' collection which was apparently not an agricultural advance by a landlord to a cropsharing tenant. The loan in question (Johns No. 66, Kohler and Ungnad No. 124) was of 17 minas of silver, a very large amount in those days. It was made for a period of about two months without interest, with a provision that in case of default it was to bear interest at the rate of 2 shekels per mina per month, i.e. 40% per annum. A vineyard and a number of slaves were delivered to the lender as security for the loan. It would seem that the large amount involved and the security given preclude the possibility of the loan having been an agricultural advance by landlord to tenant. Furthermore, there is a number of similar loans without interest in a collection of Legal and Economic Documents from Ashjâly, published by Lutz in 1931, and among these there are also some which cannot be explained on Johns' theory. Of the thirty-three transliterated and translated documents in this collection eleven are loan agreements. Ten of these loans were made without interest, but with a provision that in case of default the loan was to bear interest, without specifying the rate or amount of the interest. (The version of the interest clause suggested by Lutz in his note on page 10 is the correct one. The omission from the documents of the date of maturity of the loans presents no difficulty. This date, in the case of the grain loans, was obviously implied by custom. A loan without interest and without a maturity date, express or implied, would have been an absurdity, since the lender would not have been in a position to demand or enforce payment at any time. Also, the reference in No. 18 to the "month when the grain loans become due" clearly indicates that there was a well-established custom with regard to the time when these loans became due.) Two of the loans were obviously not seasonal advances by landlord to tenant. One of them (No. 16), a grain loan, was made for two years, a period far in excess of a seasonal loan, and the other (No. 18) was a money loan for thirty days made, according to the tablet, "in the month when the grain loans become due," that is after harvest time. (See note to the last document on page 30 of the collection.)

The writer therefore ventures the suggestion that the provision that an increase or interest was to be paid only in the case of default was made in accordance with a law which prohibited the taking of interest, unless the borrower was in default, and that reference to this law is contained in the documents published by Lutz. In several of these loan agreements, following the phrase "without interest charges" and the name of the lender, there is an obscure phrase which reads: "After the law of Dûr-Rimuš was established." It is quite obvious that the reference to the law was not made merely for the purpose of establishing the date of the loan, for, in the first place, the date is always given at the end of the tablet, and secondly, such a limitation fixes the time at one end only, which, for practical purposes, is quite useless. The law must therefore have had

was legally permitted to charge, the provision for a penalty would have been made in addition to a provision for the payment of interest within the permissible range.

In his article Tscherikower says: "As a rule heavy fines were agreed on in case of failure to repay punctually as provided in the contracts. In many cases the loans were granted for one or two months or other short periods, and the wording of many contracts suggests that it was expected at the date of the agreement that the debt would not be repaid on the fixed day. If the loans were not repaid new contracts were drawn up providing for payment of the fines stipulated in the original agreement, and the interest paid under the name of such fine would be higher than the usual quota of between 4% and 24% allowed by the royal 'diagramma.' We may therefore suppose that in many cases loans without interest were an artful method of extorting from the borrower more interest than was allowed by the laws of the country."

The question that arises in the writer's mind is: why did the lender have to advance the loan without interest at all, even if the term of the loan was a very short one, when he could have provided for interest payments up to the allowable limit, and in addition thereto he could have made provision for a penalty for the purpose of increasing his profit beyond that limit? In other words, why did the lender have to run the risk of having the loan repaid before the term of the bond

---

some bearing upon the terms of the loan. These terms were very simple. They related to the time of payment and to interest, and since the time of payment is ordinarily not a subject of legislative regulation, it is reasonable to assume that the law related to interest. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that reference to the law is contained in four out of the ten translated and transliterated loan agreements without interest, and in none of the twenty-two documents, other than loan agreements.

Finally, although the writer is not unmindful of the fact that a discussion of the relationship between the Pentateuchal law against usury and Assyrian law on this subject is outside the scope of this paper and of his competence, he wishes, nevertheless, to call attention to one point which has a direct bearing upon the interpretation of the interest clause in the Assyrian loan tablets. It seems that Exodus 22, 24 has reference to the practice of imposing upon the borrower the payment of interest as a penalty for default. A careful reading of verses 24–26 will reveal that the whole passage consists of a series of rules which the lender is to follow in case of default by the borrower. He is not to distrain the borrower in case of default, he is not to impose upon him the payment of interest as a penalty, and if he does distrain him and takes away his raiment, he is to return it to him by sundown. Indeed, R. Samuel b. Meir (Rashbam), a famous twelfth century commentator of the Pentateuch, so interprets the above passage. To the phrase "Thou shalt not lay usury upon him" he adds by way of comment "to extend his time."

expired, when he could have avoided that risk and accomplished his purpose at the same time by a combined interest-penalty clause?

It will perhaps be argued, not without some semblance of plausibility, that a penalty clause was valid only where there was no provision for a fixed interest rate during the term of the loan, and that where there was such a provision interest was to continue at the same rate even after default. However, an unequivocal answer to this argument is furnished by Tebt. 818, which contains a provision for the usual interest rate of 2 dr. per mina per month, as well as a provision for a penalty of one-half the principal amount of the loan, in case of default.

An interesting example of such a combined clause is found in the oldest extant Jewish mortgage in England.[15] This instrument is dated 1183 and recites that William of Tottenham owes a hundred marks of silver to Avigaia, the Jewess of London and Abraham, her son, for which he undertook to pay them 13½% interest. If at Christmas following he pays them forty marks the remainder of the debt is to be reckoned at only forty marks, on which he is to pay them 25%. And if he fails to pay the forty marks at Christmas, the amount of the debt is to remain a hundred marks. Apparently the amount of money actually loaned was 80 marks, and the additional amount of 20 marks was intended as a penalty for the non-payment of the installment of forty marks on the due date. The reason for this complicated arrangement is probably to be sought in a limitation of the interest rate the Jews of England were permitted to charge at that time.[16] This document may thus be considered a good illustration of what a money-lender was likely to do when all he wanted to accomplish was to evade a limitation upon the interest rate. The writer believes therefore that the no-interest feature of the Horus documents is strongly indicative of Jewish influence.

In conclusion the writer wishes to call attention to a manifest error in the translation of the Hebrew documents from Angevin England, quoted in Heichelheim's article. In all of these documents there is a clause in which the debtor states that "he has mortgaged all his property, whether it is pledged or not. This clause, as it stands is meaningless, if not self-contradictory, for if property is mortgaged, it is pledged, and if it is not pledged it is not mortgaged. The correct translation is: "He has mortgaged his property, immovable and

[15] Round, Ancient Charters, Pipe Roll Society Publ., v. 10, p. 82.

[16] See Calendar of The Plea Rolls of The Exchequer of The Jews, v. I, pp. 27–28, 34 (1220), where a limitation upon the interest rate is mentioned.

movable." Loewe misunderstood the terms דאית ליהון אחריות and רלית ליהון אחריות which mean immovable and movable property, respectively.[17]

Jacob J. Rabinowitz

Brooklyn, New York

[17] See Mishnah, Kiddushin, 1, 5 and Jastrow's Dictionary s.v. אחרית. The writer's attention has been called to the fact that Loewe had a correct translation of this clause before him in Starrs and Jewish Charters in The British Museum, v. I, p. 109 (19), for he himself wrote a note on it in v. II, p. 285, n. 1264.

THE ATTIC ORGEONES

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MARTINO PERSSON NILSSON STVDIORVM FAVTORI

> Who are these coming to the sacrifice?
> To what green altar, O mysterious priest,
> Lead'st thou that heifer lowing at the skies,
> And all her silken flanks with garlands drest?

AN INSCRIPTION from the Areopagus recently published by Meritt in Hesperia (XI, 1942, 282 ff.) has thrown new light on the structure of the type of association of which the members were called orgeones. The occasion thus presents itself to bring together what we now know about this obscure Athenian institution.[1]

The ancient records show that while orgeones, like gennetai for example, was a technical term, it lacked a corporate noun. Hence makeshifts had to be used in finding a substitute.

It is a pleasure and a duty for the authors to acknowledge their indebtedness to a number of friends. Professor Campbell Bonner, of the University of Michigan, very kindly read a first draft of the whole and a second draft of Nock's part, greatly to the advantage of the paper. Professor Benjamin D. Meritt of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, came to our aid, when consulted, with his usual courtesy; and so did our colleagues at Harvard, Professors Joshua Whatmough, George H. Chase, Werner Jaeger, John Finley, Sterling Dow, and Dr. Herbert Bloch. Ferguson is specifically indebted to Professor Dow for writing Appendix 3, and Nock to Dr. Francis R. Walton for helpful criticism.

[1] Two cases are known of non-Athenian orgeones, one from Megara (IG VII 33, dated by Dittenberger on the basis of spelling "before imperial times") and the other from Teos (Michel, Recueil, 1307, ca. 150 B.C.). Though in each case the name is due in part to restorations, the restorations are not improbable. In IG VII 33 the name heads a list of four persons, in Michel, 1307, it appears in one of fourteen crowns cut on a grave monument. I am inclined to believe that we have to do with borrowings from Athens (cf. Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens, 15); but the use of the word in a non-specialized sense by the poets (cf. Appendix 1) may explain its appearance outside Attica in these late texts.

Gennetai could refer to themselves and could be referred to as a genos. Orgeones, however, had to designate themselves, when the situation required it, as an association simply (koinon) or as a thiasos,[2] a more expressive term, but one commonly avoided because it was used in a technical sense by the phratries and in a general sense with a certain flavor of festive disorderliness. One late organization, which accommodated itself to contemporary usage by substituting on occasion for orgeones the name derived from the god it served, Dionysiastai, employed as a self-determinant the colorless collective *synodos*. This lack of a specific corporate substantive was an embarrassment to the orgeones themselves in making their records and to us in analyzing them and presenting their contents to our readers. The word orgeones has no English equivalent. "Sacrificing associates" is as near as we can come to its meaning.

I. References to orgeones were obviously not infrequent in classical literature. Hence in the lists of hard words or proper names, not self-explanatory, out of which the ancient Greek lexicons developed, definitions of the term, drawn from various sources, were regularly given. It would serve no purpose to quote all these definitions. Some of them which identify orgeones and gennetai (Pollux, III 52; Bekker Anecd. Gr. I 227; Etym. Magn. s.v. γεννῆται), or orgeones and thiasotai (Etym. Magn. 454) are manifestly incorrect. Others which elucidate the general character of the orgeones or differentiate them from other analogous organizations are helpful. Suidas gives various definitions s.v. ὀργεῶνες· "Seleukos states in his commentary on the *axones* of Solon that persons holding meetings centering in various heroes or gods were called orgeones"; "orgeones are those sacrificing to gods privately founded. Ὀργιάζειν means to perform the 'orgies' of the gods, that is, mysteries and customary rites."[3] (Σέλευκος δ' ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι

[2] Thiasos occurs in a poem (IG II² 2948), and its use there is determined by poetic diction and the exigencies of meter (cf. Poland, 10). It is, however, found in the unpublished inscription referred to on p. 93.

[3] Νόμιμα (νομιζόμενα below) could hardly be used in the narrower sense of

τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξόνων ὀργεῶνάς φησι καλεῖσθαι τοὺς συλλόγους ἔχοντας περί τινας ἥρωας ἢ θεούς. Ὀργεῶνες οἱ τοῖς ἰδίᾳ ἀφιδρυμένοις θεοῖς ὀργιάζοντες· ὀργιάζειν δέ ἐστιν τὰ τῶν θεῶν ὄργια τελεῖν, τουτέστι μυστήρια καὶ νόμιμα). In this text the position of ἥρωας is noteworthy, and, doubtless, deliberate, since it was natural for a Greek to give precedence to θεούς. Seleukos *knew*, I think, that orgeones were primarily concerned with heroes. Harpocration's definition runs (s.v. ὀργεῶνας): "orgeones are those meeting to honor gods or heroes. Ὀργιάζειν means to sacrifice and perform customary rites (θύειν καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα δρᾶν)." Harpocration and Suidas append this item: "Possibly it was afterwards the custom for individuals coming together to do honor to the dead also to be named thus, i.e. orgeones, as is to be seen from the will of Theophrastos" (Μήποτε δὲ ὕστερον νενόμισται τὸ ἐπὶ τιμῇ τινὰς τῶν ἀποθανόντων συνιέναι καὶ ὀργεῶνας ὁμοίως ὠνομάσθαι, ὡς ἔστι συνιδεῖν ἐκ τῶν Θεοφράστου διαθηκῶν). Pollux 8, 107 gives this definition: "orgeones are persons who throughout Attica (or, taking κατὰ distributively, "grouped some in one deme and some in another") offer certain sacrifices on set days" (οἱ κατὰ δήμους ἐν τακταῖς ἡμέραις θύοντες θυσίας τινάς). Harpocration s.v. δημοτελῆ καὶ δημοτικὰ ἱερά reports: "Sacrifices given at the public cost and by the demes differ from one another and from the sacrifices of orgeones and genê, as Deinarchos makes clear in his speech against Stephanos." This point is elaborated without significant additions in Bekker Anecd. Gr. I 240, 28.

It must be conceded that these definitions are not very informative. They suffice, however, to establish the distinctiveness of the association, and they relate the orgeones to sacrifices offered at the shrines of heroes or gods throughout Attica on the occasions set for reunions there of the members. They list various meanings, real or supposed,[4] of the word ὀργεῶνες, which help us little; but they give us a basis for dis-

---

"funeral rites" when coupled with ὀργιάζειν (Nock). The word occurs only once in the official records of the orgeones. In the poem inscribed on a stele set up in the shrine of the Dionysiastai (below, 116) we find τὸ σέβειν, Βάκχε, τὰ σοὶ νόμιμα (IG II² 2948). Here the word means anything but funeral rites.

[4] See Appendix 1.

tinguishing the class of orgeones — those centered in heroes or gods (Class A below, p. 73 ff.) —, the mention of which in classical texts prompted the lexicographers to explain what they were, from a second class of orgeones (Class B below, p. 95 ff.), which the lexicographers neglected and which the inscriptions have brought to our attention. From the definitions, such as they are, we learn that the sacrifices offered by the orgeones were paid for by the orgeones themselves, not by the state, and that the shrines in which they were offered were established by private, not by public, action. The citation of Seleukos is important for the history of the institution since it makes it humanly certain that orgeones were mentioned in the laws of Solon.

II. A second group of sources relating to orgeones consists of two Athenian laws, which both extend our knowledge of the history of the association and relate it to the state. An excerpt from the code of Solon made in the Digest (XLVII, 22, 4) runs as follows: "If a demos, or phratries, or orgeones of heroes, or gennetai, or messmates, or funerary associates, or thiasotai, or pirates, or traders make arrangements among themselves, these shall be binding unless forbidden by public writings" (*ἐὰν δὲ δῆμος ἢ φράτορες ἢ ἡρώων ὀργεῶνες ἢ γεννῆται ἢ σύσσιτοι ἢ ὁμόταφοι ἢ θιασῶται ἢ ἐπὶ λείαν οἰχόμενοι ἢ εἰς ἐμπορίαν, ὅ τι ἂν τούτων διαθῶνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, κύριον εἶναι ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαγορεύῃ δημόσια γράμματα*).[5]

[5] The Mss. readings (*ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργίων ἢ ναῦται*, F. *Μηνυταί* appears in BS instead of *ἢ ναῦται*) have neither sense nor syntax. The restoration *ἢ ὀργεῶνες ἢ γεννῆται* (Wilamowitz, Ant. v. Karystos, 278; Busolt, Griech. Gesch. II², 117) takes no account of *ἱερῶν*. Mommsen's text *ἱερῶν ὀργίων θύται* does justice to the idea that the corruption involved three words; but can *γεννῆται* have been absent in the law? We may also ask whether *ἱερῶν* is not redundant with *ὀργίων*. *Ὀργίων* is itself objectionable (cf. below, p. 131). Seleukos, as we have seen, brings *περὶ ἥρωας* into close connection with *ὀργεῶνες*. I therefore propose the emendation incorporated in my text. It simply regards *ἱερῶν* as a corruption of *ἡρώων* and in other respects follows Wilamowitz. In fact the native Attic orgeones were preponderantly, if not exclusively, *ἡρώων ὀργεῶνες*. Poland's distinction (212) between *Heroen im engerem Sinne — vergötterte Sterbliche* — and *die schlichte Götter* of orgeonic cult, though correct in substance, would mislead if it withheld from *die schlichte Götter* the name heroes. Our oldest orgeonic record concerns a cult of "the hero and the Heroines" (no. (1) below, p. 73). Nock would like to insert *ἢ θεῶν* after *ἡρώων*. The emendation of De Sanctis (Atthis², 67, n. 1) transposing *ἱερῶν*

This law is definitely ascribed to Solon. The second reaches us without any precise attribution. It was quoted by Philochoros in the fourth book of his Atthis (Frg. 94; cf. Suidas, s.v. orgeones and Harpocration, s.v. gennetai) and runs as follows: "Regarding orgeones Philochoros also wrote: the phratries shall of necessity admit both orgeones and *homogalaktes* whom (Philochoros explains) we call gennetai" (*περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀργεώνων γέγραφε καὶ Φιλόχορος· τοὺς δὲ φρατόρας ἐπάναγκες δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ τοὺς ὁμογάλακτας, οὓς γεννήτας καλοῦμεν*).

The historical value of the first law depends in some degree upon whether it derives from the code of 594 B.C. or from the code of 409–01 B.C., which, despite revisions, was still referred to as Solonian (cf. Demosth. XXIV 142). It can also be thought that the commentary on the *axones* of Solon published by the Alexandrian grammarian Seleukos (above) dealt with the code of the fourth century. As we may judge from the decree of Teisamenos (Andoc. De Myst. 83), interpreted in the light of the new fragments of the *stelai* of the Royal Stoa on which the code of 409–01 B.C. was cut, the revision of the old code, already pretty well completed and inscribed, was said in 403 B.C. to contain "the laws of Solon and the *thesmoi* of Draco" (Andoc. I 82–83; see J. Oliver, Hesperia, IV 5 ff., Ferguson, Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps, 144 ff. and S. Dow, Hesperia, X 31 ff.; also A. Koerte, Glotta, XXV, 1936, 134 ff.). While the evidence is indirect, we are

---

ὀργίων ἣ ναῦται from its position in the Mss. to a position after *θιασῶται*, is rightly rejected by Guarducci (Riv. di Fil. 1935, 333): it makes *θιασῶται* comprehend *θιασῶται*, *ὀργεῶνες*, and *γεννῆται*, if it does not omit *γεννῆται* altogether. Her own suggestion is *ἱερῶν ὀργίων (συ)ν(θ)ύται*, which is a trifle closer to the Mss. than Mommsen's *θύται*, but is open to the same objections. P. J. T. Endenburg (Koinoonia en Gemeenschap van Zaken bij de Grieken in den klassieken Tijd, Utrecht Diss. 1937, 163 ff.) suggests *κοινωνοί* in place of Mommsen's *θύται*, but this does not help; and, in general, his idea that the various *κοινωνίαι* cited by Aristotle in his Ethics (Nicomachean, 1160a 14 ff., Eudemian, 1241b 24) are simply the Solonian associations differently named, is too far-fetched.

Τινές is commonly inserted in the text after *διαθῶνται*; but a partitive genitive as subject is so common in Greek that I believe, with Adolf Wilhelm, Oester. Jahresh. XIV, 211; cf. Busolt, Griech. Staatskunde, I 192, n. 4, that it may be understood without being present. I take it that the statute envisaged two sets of reciprocal arrangements, one of two or more of the groups, and another of the members of a single group.

justified by it in believing that the revision of 409–404 B.C. established a substantial part of the code in the Royal Stoa which was basic during the fourth century, and was not radical in substance. Archaic terms and provisions were preserved even though they had become wholly or substantially obsolete (cf. Lysias, X 15–20; Demos. XXIII 33 ff.). It will be remembered that Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 8, 3) was able to quote laws of Solon which at his time were no longer used. Apart from verbal changes the revision may have consisted mainly of additions like those made in 403/01 B.C. (cf. Class. Studies Capps, 146 f.). Since the code of 409/01 B.C., which contained references to *axones*, and doubtless also to *kyrbeis*,[6] was readily accessible in the Royal Stoa, even if it was this, rather than Solon's original, which Seleukos discussed, and from which the law in the Digest was derived, we may readily believe that the law bestowing rights of contract on private associations belongs to the legislation of 594 B.C. Revisions of the classical period could not conceivably be responsible for phrases like ἐπὶ λείαν or εἰς ἐμπορίαν οἰχόμενοι. Piracy would certainly not be recognized by a statute originating in fourth century Athens (cf. K. Latte, Gnomon, 1927, 39), and the obvious word for traders would then be ἔμποροι. It may, however, be granted to Wilamowitz (Ant. v. Karystos, 278) that the final phrase of the law is not verbally authentic. The first word of the law, demos, should, I believe, be translated as "village," not deme (Arist. Poetics, III, 3; Ath. Pol. XVI 5). It is incredible that the villages of Attica lacked a local organization of some sort before they were engrossed as demes of the state in the Kleisthenian system. The Solonian thiasotai were, I take it, members of thiasoi like those of Dionysos and Herakles discussed in note 12 and Appendix 2. They cannot be members of the subdivisions of the phratries since these derived whatever rights they possessed from the phratries, whose name follows demos in Solon's list of licensed associations. Moreover, we have to take account of the probability that the internal organization of the phratries in thiasoi is post-Solonian (cf. below, nn. 37,

[6] In 363/62 B.C. a provision of the fourth century code is said to be ἐκ κύρβεων (cf. Ferguson, Hesperia, VII, 5, 87; L. Holland, AJA 1941, 346 ff.).

48). The thiasoi which are included in the comprehensive enumeration of *deipna* given in Athenaeus (V 186a) are conceivably feasts of the associations to which Solon's thiasotai belonged. The banquets of the phratries and the orgeones are listed separately.

The later thiasotai (Poland, 20 ff.) were preponderantly aliens, not citizens, and may not have possessed as a class rights of association before the invalidation in 306 B.C. of the law of Sophokles of Sunion which sought to outlaw the Peripatetics. (Wilamowitz, 266 ff.; Ferguson, Hell. Ath., 104 ff.; Bury, The Hellenistic Age, 6 f.). Poland's statement (20), "Die meisten in Frage kommenden Thiasoteninschriften fallen in die kurze Spanne Zeit von 302 bis 278/7," when checked by new finds and dates, appears to be substantially correct, and, if my surmise is accepted, it becomes increasingly significant. In earlier times such associations could have acquired a hieron only by a special vote of the Athenian state, as is shown by the steps which had to be taken with this end in view by the Thracians (IG II² 1283), the Egyptians, and the Kitieis (IG II² 337, 333/32 B.C.) in establishing the cults of Bendis, Isis, and Aphrodite in Athens (cf. Plato, Laws, X 909 D). It is to the point to note that the thiasotai of aliens whose records fall in the period defined by Poland either had (IG II² 1261, 1263, 1271, 1273, 1277, 1278), or may have had, hiera of their own. There is no suggestion anywhere that they had had to obtain a special vote of the Athenian people in order to acquire them. Obviously the law of Solon applied to associations of citizens alone. Its bearing on the question at issue in 306 B.C. was consequently only indirect.

We can accordingly identify three types of Attic thiasotai, all distinct from the orgeones, the first two old, the third relatively late: (1) thiasotai of Dionysos and Herakles — *the* thiasotai of the Solonian law. The groups are called *θίασοι*, or, perhaps, on occasion less specifically *κοινά*. They may, I think, have been at times improvisations; (2) thiasotai of Zeus Phratrios or of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria. The groups are called *θίασοι*, and they are subdivisions of the phratries and probably Kleisthenian in origin; (3) thiasotai of cults, for the

most part, though not exclusively (IG II² 1298, 1297), foreign. The groups are commonly, though not exclusively (*θίασος* occasionally appears, IG II² 1275, 1297, 4985), called simply *κοινά*. They arose in the course of the fourth century B.C. and for the most part after 306 B.C. They consist ordinarily of aliens, males alone or males and females combined, with only an occasional citizen (IG II² 2859, 265/64 B.C.?, cf. Dow, Hesperia, XII 162) in association with them before 200 B.C. (Hell. Ath. 219 n. 5; Dow, HTR, 1937, 197). In the schools of philosophy, the members of which were thiasotai in fact, if not in name (below, p. 126), citizens and aliens mingled from their founding.

Orgeones undoubtedly existed before the time of Solon.[7] After his legislation they had a large measure of autonomy and hence each group of them might and undoubtedly did alter its constitution as circumstances required. Two or more such groups might, for example, unite and sacrifice in common, and a single group might add to its original hero other recipients of this cult. Offices might be added or dropped. Associations might open their ranks to others than descendants (*ἔκγονοι*). The orgeones had full control not only of their shrines with their appurtenances, but also of their capital funds, so full that they could consider alienating their possessions (*κτήματα*) altogether or in significant part (No. (6)).

The date at which the second law was enacted is a subject of controversy. The text itself is evidence that, whatever date is assigned to it, the orgeones were then a considerable part of the civic society; it also suggests that in this part were included people who ranked next to the gennetai. The law was mentioned by Philochoros in his account of the events of the outgoing fifth century; but it cannot have been enacted thus late because at that time Thracians had been permitted to associate themselves as orgeones of Bendis, yet as aliens they were debarred from being phrateres.[8] Busolt (Griech. Gesch.² II, 116,

[7] Excavations conducted on the west slope of the Akropolis in the shrine belonging prior to 420/19 to the orgeones of Amynos (see below, p. 87) have shown that the precinct was in use in Pisistratid and pre-Pisistratid times (A. Koerte, Ath. Mitt. XVIII, 1893, 231 ff., XXI, 1896, 288 f., 308 f.); cf. below, Appendix 1.

[8] In view of the many incidents of the period 412–403 B.C. which may have prompted Philochoros to cite the law it is perhaps foolish to fix upon one; but

n. 4; cf. Griech. Staatskunde, I 252 and n. 2), Meyer (Gesch. d. Alt.[1] II, 803) and others enter it in their account of the Kleisthenian legislation, though Busolt concedes that it may have been earlier and De Sanctis (Storia dei Greci, I 481) and Nilsson (A.J.P. LIX 1938, 385) claim it for Solon. I am inclined to agree with them, but I do not think that Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 21, 6, proves the point, as Nilsson affirms. What Aristotle says is that Kleisthenes "allowed all to retain their phratries, etc."; he does not exclude the admission to old phratries, or to new, of men who had not belonged to phratries theretofore (cf. below, n. 48). The law quoted by Philochoros put compulsion on the phratries to admit orgeones as well as gennetai. Such a law is intelligible in Solon's period — one of transition from an aristocracy of birth to a timocracy, not at a time when the social problem was the integration of the lowest rank of citizens with the rest. Consequently, the case for not attributing the statute to Kleisthenes rests on the determination of the level of society in which the orgeones belonged. What influences me in pushing it back to Solon is the conception I have formed that they belonged rather to the middle than to the lower classes (see Synopsis, III A 16). In other words, they could not have remained as a mass *aphratores* till 507 B.C.: in fact, the laws of Draco, as they appeared in the *axones* of Solon, took it for granted that an Athenian had phrateres (IG I² 115; cf. below, pp. 105 f.). There is only one way of dating the law as late as Kleisthenes. That is to assume that the phratries had enrolled orgeones freely prior to its enactment without being required by statute to do so, and that the point of the law lay in the compulsion it applied. I find it difficult, however, to follow this way, because, if Kleisthenes, who "took the demos into partnership" (Her. V 66; Arist. Ath. Pol. 20), had been the legislator, he would have made the compulsory admission to phratries applicable to citizen-elements lower down in society than the orgeones.

the decision made when the Thracians were authorized to become orgeones without becoming phrateres, involving, as it did, a definite alteration or infraction of the Solonian law, created an incident which an Atthidograph might be expected to discuss. In such a discussion he could hardly fail to quote the pertinent section of the code.

It should be observed that the law quoted by Philochoros required the phrateres to admit both orgeones and gennetai, not genê and associations of orgeones. In the fourth century there were doubtless orgeones and gennetai in every phratry, but irrespective of their membership in these outside associations, phrateres were divided for phratry purposes in groups of their own called thiasoi. The evidence for this conclusion does not need restatement.[9] That orgeones as a group did not form a constituent unit of a phratry is made abundantly clear by Isaeus, II 14: "After my adoption he introduced me to his phrateres in the presence of my opponents and he registered me on the roll of his deme and on that of his orgeones" (*ποιησάμενος εἰσάγει με εἰς τοὺς φράτερας παρόντων τούτων, καὶ εἰς τοὺς δημότας με ἐγγράφει καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας*). "Why," asks pertinently W. Wyse in his commentary on this passage,[10] "did he tack on *καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας* at the end of the sentence, if the *ὀργεῶνες* in question[11] were a constituent element of the *φρατρία*?" The same line of argument, applied to Isaeus, VII 13, and [Demos.], LIX 59, shows that the genê were not subdivisions of the phratries.[12]

[9] Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, II 260 ff.; Ferguson, Class. Phil. 1910, 257 ff.; Wade-Gery, Class. Quart. 1925, 131 ff.; Guarducci, Riv. di Fil. 1935, 336 ff., and Mem. d. Accad. d. Lincei, Cl. d. Sc. Mor. VI, 6, 1937.

[10] The Speeches of Isaeus, 251.

[11] By reading into the text of the second Athenian law quoted above, p. 65, something that it does not contain, namely that orgeones and gennetai were admitted to the phratries *en bloc*, scholars have reached the erroneous conclusion that there were two kinds of orgeones, one private (as in Isaeus, II 14), and the other public; cf. Wyse, l.c. and Bruck, Totenteil und Seelgerät, 240. It has been assumed by Bruck and Guarducci (Riv. di Fil. l.c.) that the two genê and two thiasoi of IG II^2 2723 (ca. 350 B.C.) were units of a single association because they advanced money on the security of the same piece of property. On the same basis, however, we should be forced to subordinate to a larger whole the Kekropidai, Lykomidai, and Phlyeis of IG II^2 2670 — which is impossible.

[12] A third passage in Isaeus (IX, 30) calls for a word of explanation. It runs: *καὶ εἰς τοὺς θιάσους τοὺς Ἡρακλέους ἐκεῖνον [αὐτὸν] εἰσήγαγεν (ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐμὸς) ἵνα μετέχοι τῆς κοινωνίας. αὐτοὶ δ' ὑμῖν οἱ θιασῶται μαρτυρήσουσιν.* The incident of the introduction is reported by the speaker for the purpose of proving the long-standing intimacy of his father with the alleged testator (Astyphilos, his step-son, the speaker's half-brother): in the other two cases the incidents are reported and the testimony of the witnesses presented to the court with a view to establishing the reality of adoptions. In other words the thiasotai of Isaeus, IX 30 were competent witnesses on the matter at issue whether they were staid citizens or roisterers; a "roving

From these laws it is clear that whether the associations of orgeones were public or private institutions is a matter of definition. Their general position after the reforms of Kleis-

soldier" like Astyphilos was more apt to feel at ease with the latter than with the former.

A *κοινὸν θιασωτῶν* of Herakles (IG II² 2343, early fourth cent. B.C.) is known from an inscription cut on a trapeza. It consisted of 15 members and a priest of Herakles. This may be a group (or one of two or more groups) such as that to which Astyphilos was introduced. In all probability such groups were associated with many of the temples of Herakles in Attica (cf. e.g. Theophr. Char. XXVII 5). The scene of Aristophanes' Daitaleis was set in a temple of Herakles. "On y célébrait un festin, sans doute à la suite du sacrifice, puis des choeurs de danse. Le thiase d'Héraclès, cité par Isée, n'était peut-être pas autre chose" (Foucart, Assoc. relig. 153). Suidas, s.v. Δαιταλεῖς says: *δαιτυμόνες καὶ θιασῶται καὶ συμπόται.* Cf. Hesychius, s.v. *θιασῶνες· οἶκοι ἐν οἷς συνιόντες δειπνοῦσιν οἱ θίασοι.* Cf. also Diod. IV 241, 6, and below, Appendix 2.

Modern editors have taken exception to *θιάσους*, and Sauppe, followed by Wyse (cf. 643), has replaced it with *θιασώτας*, others with *θίασον*. I think with Forster (Loeb Classics) that no change is required. It seems to me likely that Harpocration had a text which contained *τοὺς θιάσους*. He cites Isaeus specifically to show that the members of thiasoi (*τῶν θιάσων*) were called thiasotai. He also cites Demos. XVIII 260 (cf. XIX 199). There *θιάσους* appears and thence he draws the definition that a thiasos was *τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον πλῆθος ἐπὶ τελετῇ καὶ τιμῇ θεῶν.* "a throng assembled to render worship and honor to gods." *τελετῇ* is Demosthenic. If *θιάσους* in Isaeus is taken to imply, as it does in Demosthenes, an organized throng, Sauppe's objection (Ausgew. Schr. 788) falls to the ground. *Θίασος* often means an association or club. Its plural in this sense would be a group of clubs, and it may be, as Ziehen (Leges sacrae, II 1 33 n.) maintains, that the plural is so used in IG II² 1177, *ὅπως ἂν μηδεὶς — — θιά[σους] συνάγει* (*συνάγειν* means to "found," cf. IG II² 1297, l. 4; 1322, l. 1); but in this awkwardly constructed sentence *θιά[σους]* occurs in a sequence of plurals and may mean simply "a thiasos." In his speech against Phryne Euthias declared (Sauppe, Fr. Or. Gr. II 320): *ἐπεδείξα τοίνυν ὑμῖν ἀσεβῆ Φρύνην, κωμάσασαν ἀναιδῶς, καινοῦ θεοῦ εἰσηγήτριαν, θιάσους ἀνδρῶν ἐκθέσμους καὶ γυναικῶν συναγαγοῦσαν.* Athenaeus employs *τοὺς θιάσους* where we should have expected *θιασωτικά*: *τά τε φυλετικὰ δεῖπνα καὶ τὰ δημοτικὰ προσέταξαν, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς θιάσους καὶ τὰ φρατρικὰ καὶ πάλιν τὰ ὀργεωνικὰ λεγόμενα.* By following his lead we might justify *τοὺς θιάσους* = "banquets" in Isaeus, but probably it is better, in so doing, to follow the lead of Harpokration and the example of Demosthenes. If *θίασον* had stood in the text we should expect *κοινοῦ* instead of *κοινωνίας*.

The definition of thiasos given by Hesychios (*χοροῦ σύστασις*; *θιασῶται* = *χορευταί*) may reflect uses of the word in the Athenian poets, Euripides (Bacch. 680), and Aristophanes (Frogs 156), quoted by Poland, 16ff. where *θιάσους* may be translated "bands." Thiasoi = "throng of banqueters" are as intelligible in the cult of Herakles as thiasoi = "throng of bacchanals" in the cult of Dionysos. P. Roussel (Isaée, Discours, 171, n. 1) puts the matter tersely when he says: "Ce dieu, grand buveur et grand mangeur, était le patron désigné de sociétés dont l'existence se manifestait sans doute surtout par des banquets." The text quoted from Isaios shows that the members of these thiasoi were called thiasotai.

thenes seems to have been like that of the old Attic phylae and trittyes (Class. Stud. Capps, 151 ff.), and the phratries and genê. They continued to exist, tolerated and undisturbed.[13] Aristotle (Eudemian Ethics, 1241b, 25) affirms, for what it is worth, that orgeones and phrateres were alike parts of the polis. It is to be noticed, however, that while the polis made use of the old phylae, trittyes and genê to have certain state services performed, and that while it called on phrateres to participate in certain procedures connected with cases of homicide (IG I^2 115, cf. R. Bonner and G. Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, II 208 f.), and required them to enroll aliens upon whom it conferred citizenship, we have record of its having put demands of this sort upon orgeones only in the case of the orgeones of Bendis (see below, p. 103).[14] This association, however, was exceptional in that it was authorized as well as controlled by the state. The lexicographers generally define the orgeones as privately organized and supported. It seems clear that, while the state recognized the genus, it left it to its citizens individually to plant and cultivate the species. Orgeones thus differ from phylae and phratries, genê and trittyes in that these could be created by the state alone — a point of public law which is not affected by the facts that one genos is known to have become two by fission (Hesperia, VII 12) and two phratries seem to have become one by coalescence (IG II^2 1241). The view that there were two kinds of orgeones, one public and the other private, results from a misunderstanding (cf. notes 9 and 11). While it is true that the orgeones both before and after Kleisthenes were left to their own devices it is also true that their vitality was not sapped by the creation in 507 B.C. of parallel organizations integrated with the new Kleisthenian state system.

Membership in orgeones was hereditary, as it was in the demes and the genê and the phratries. What entitled a man to membership was descent from a member. In the case presented

[13] See below, p. 105 f.

[14] The *νομοθέται* who are said by Athenaeus (V, 185 c, cf. n. 12) to have ordained "the so-called" orgeonic feasts are to be taken as "law givers" in general — the *εὑρεταί* of legislation. The passage gives no warrant for supposing that the code of Solon (Athens) required the orgeones to give "feasts."

by Isaeus (II 14) an adopted son was entered by his legal father on the roll of his association. The orgeones affected by the law quoted by Philochoros were potential phrateres, hence *Athenaioi*. Once this law was put into effect its work was done, and associations of orgeones constituted after the date of its enactment would have to be reserved to *Athenaioi* (see above, p. 68 and below, p. 106) both because of the existence of the law itself and because it is incredible that groups of aliens could acquire citizenship — a jealously guarded privilege — by forming associations of which the members called themselves orgeones.

III. A third group of sources relating to the orgeones consists of records of their proceedings inscribed on stone on their own order, or on their own behalf (No. 5). The information they yield is, accordingly, direct and authentic. They emanate from at least a dozen different associations and are spread thin over a long period of time — from ca. 450 B.C. to ca. 70 B.C., with the majority lying between 340 and 170 B.C.

These associations fall into two classes: A. orgeones of whom the characteristic feature is the cult of heroes or heroines or both, and B. those of whom the characteristic feature is the cult of higher deities, mostly of foreign origin.

Class A

(1) At the head of the records of Class A we place the new inscription from the Areopagus. This was cut on stone early in the third century B.C., and it was then that the decree of the orgeones which ordered the *anagraphe* was enacted. The order, however, required the inclusion in the *anagraphe* of the decrees of the orgeones which came down from ancient times, and the first of these is preserved almost intact on the stone. It runs as follows: "Decreed by the orgeones: the Host (*hestiator*) shall offer the sacrifice on the 17th and 18th of Hekatombaion. On the first day he shall sacrifice a suckling pig to the Heroines and a full-grown victim to the Hero and he shall set up a table, and on the second day, a full-grown victim to the

Hero.[15] He shall reckon up his expenses and spend no more than the revenue. [He shall distribute] the flesh as follows,[16] to the orgeones present (a portion), to sons a portion not exceeding a

[15] In the ancient decree he is nameless. In the early third century he is Echelos. The chances are that if he had had a name at the time of the ancient decree he would have got it in a text of this sort. Echelos, paired with Iasile and associated with other heroes, heroines and higher deities (IG II² 4545–4548) had a cult in Echelidai near Phaleron; and the most probable explanation of his appearance in a text cut on a *stele* found on the Areopagus is that the koinon of orgeones of the Hero consisted of people who lived in Echelidai near the Hippodrome (cf. Milchhöfer, PW V, 1911; Walter, Eph. Arch. 1937, 97 ff.; Ferguson, Hesperia, 1938, 25 f.; Meritt, Hesperia, 1942, 284 ff.), and assembled for joint sacrifices with the orgeones of the Heroines in a hieron which belonged primarily to the latter and was situated in the *asty* near the locale of Kalliphanes.

[16] Beginning at this point the text translated runs as follows: [*ν*|*έμειν*] *δὲ τὰ κρέα τοῖς* {*οις*} *ὀργεῶσι τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ τοῖ*[*ς ὑ*|*οῖς τὴν*] *εἰς ἡμίσεαν καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶ ταῖς τῶν ὀργεώ*[*ν*|*ων ἂν ἦι β*]*οῦς, ταῖς ἐλευθέραις τὴν ἰσαίαν καὶ ταῖς θυγ*[*α*|*τράσι τὴν εἰς ἡμί*]*σεαν καὶ ἀκολούθωι μιᾶι τὴν εἰς ἡμ*[*ί*|*σεαν· παραδοῦναι δὲ τ*]*ῶι ἀνδρὶ τῆς γυναικὸς τὴν με*[*ρίδα*]. The only restoration which calls for comment is the conditional clause [*ἂν ἦι β*]*οῦς* in line 20. Meritt fills this lacuna with [*μετ' αὐτ*]*ούς*, which must mean that, after the orgeones and the sons received their portions, the apportionment to the women began. The position of [*μετ' αὐτ*]*ούς* seems to me difficult: we should expect it before *ταῖς γυναιξί*. A further difficulty is that the stone has not room at the beginning of line 20 for six letters after *ὀργεών*|*ων* and before *ρ*, one of which is mu and none an iota. The excess is at least one letter and probably more (see Dow, Appendix 3, below, p. 135). The restoration suggested by me (4½ spaces) fits nicely. In any case [*μετ' αὐτ*]*ούς* is otiose since the order of listing the recipients of portions is ordinarily the order of apportioning, cf. F. Puttkammer, Quo modo Graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint, p. 58; and even though the substitution of *ὀργέων* for *ὀργεώνων* (below, p. 82), against which the form *ὀργεῶσι* weighs heavily, would make [*μετ' αὐτ*]*ους* epigraphically possible, it should, I think, be rejected. Otherwise the "ancient decree" does not contain a single redundant word.

The restoration [*ἂν ἦι β*]*οῦς* makes the distributions of meat to the womenfolk contingent on the size of "the full-grown animal" sacrificed to the Hero. (For *γαλαθηνός* = "suckling" contrasted with *τελέον* = "full-grown" rather than "perfect" — all victims had to be perfect — see IG II² 1361; Ziehen, Leges Sacrae II 1, 41, p. 117 n.; cf. Ditt. Syll. 601², 31 = 1015³ and 615², 35 = 1024³: *τέλειον καὶ δέκα* [*ἄρ*]*νες*]. If a definite animal had been required it would have been named. How wide a latitude in the choice of sacrificial animals was permissible may be seen from Ziehen, no. 119). If a sheep or a goat were the utmost that the funds at the disposal of the Host allowed him to purchase without exceeding the revenue, the yield of flesh would, it is assumed with my restoration, have sufficed to provide portions for the orgeones and their sons alone. There would have been nothing for the women. A contingency of sacrifice of this sort accords with Attic and Greek usage. Thus in IG I² 190 (ca. 420 B.C.), a badly broken table of sacrifices and priestly perquisites, we find *hιέρεια λαμβα*[*νέτο*] - - - , [*ἐὰ*]*ν δὲ βῶς θυέται, σάρ*-[*κας* - -], while in a *lex sacra* of Ceos (Ditt. Syll. 522² = 958³) it is ordained *θύειν*

half,[17] and to the womenfolk of the orgeones [if an ox were sacrificed], — to free matrons [18] a portion equal to (that of the orgeones), to daughters a portion not exceeding a half, and to

---

δὲ τὸμ μὲν βοῦν βεβληκότα, τὴν δὲ οἶν βεβληκ[υ]ῖαν. ἂν δέ τι καὶ ὑαμινὸν θύηι, μὴ πρεσβύτερον ἐνιαυσίου καὶ ἐγμ[ή]νου. Similarly in a Milesian inscription of ca. 400 B.C. (Ditt. Syll.[3] 1002) we have ἦν δὲ [βῦν] ἐρ[δη]ι, δύο κρέα, κτλ. Nor is it contrary to Greek practice to make special provision for the distribution of the flesh of oxen included with other animals in a sacrifice. Thus a Delphian decree (Ditt. Syll. $281^2 = 604^3$) reports of two *theori* that θυσίαν συνετέλεσαν τῶι θεῶι ἑκατόμβαν βούπρω[ιρον, καὶ] δωδεκαίδα βούπρωιρον τᾶι Ἀθάναι, καὶ τὰ κρέα τᾶμ βοῶν διένειμαν τοῖς πολ[ίταις]. Cf. also Hesperia, VII 3, l. 33.

The space does not permit the restoration [ἂν θυῆται β]οῦς, even if we should substitute ὀργέων for ὀργεώνων. Parallels for ἂν ἥι βοῦς probably abound. Nock has given me three [Demosth.] XLIII 57: ἐὰν μὲν πατὴρ ᾖ ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἢ υἱεῖς - - - ἐὰν δὲ τούτων μηδεὶς ᾖ; P. Oxy. 744 = Hunt-Edgar, Select Papyri, I 294, 105: ἐὰν πολλὰ πολλῶν τέκῃς, ἐὰν ἦν (*sic*) ἄρσενον, ἄφες, ἐὰν ἦν θήλεα, ἔκβαλε; Exodus I 16: ὅταν μαιοῦσθε τὰς Ἑβραίας καὶ ὦσι πρὸς τῷ τίκτειν, ἐὰν μὲν ἄρσεν ᾖ, ἀποκτείνατε αὐτό, ἐὰν δὲ θῆλυ, περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό.

[17] The phrase τὴν εἰς ἡμίσεαν is translated by Meritt "a half share." The Greek for "half share" would, however, be τὴν ἡμίσεαν or τὸ ἥμισυ. Cf. Athen. IV 143 c, e, from which we learn that the juniors, i.e. sons, received half portions at the Cretan public mess. The εἰς carries the notion of "up to and including," "to the extent of"; cf. Aristoph. Thesmo. 452: ὥστ' οὐκέτ' ἐμπολῶμεν οὐδ' εἰς ἥμισυ. Theoph. Char. XXIII 8: ἱματισμὸν ζητῆσαι εἰς δύο τάλαντα. Polyb. XXX 25 7 = XXXI 3: οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν εἰς χιλίους. The use of this phrase, τὴν εἰς ἡμίσεαν, to define the portion to be given ἀκολούθωι μιᾶι shows that μιᾶι must mean one per matron, i.e., one per family. If it meant as Meritt (287) assumes, one maid-servant and only one, her portion would have been defined precisely, since she would have to be a definite person attached to the orgeones as a whole. Τὴν εἰς ἡμίσεαν implies a plurality of receivers. It seems to me doubtful whether ἐλεύθεραι would have been used if there were only one ἀκόλουθος.

[18] Meritt writes (287, n. 28): "The primary meaning of ἐλευθέραις here in line 20 seems to be 'independent'; the dative form depends on ἰσαίαν." He takes ταῖς ἐλευθέραις to be "women who were orgeones of their own right" as distinct from "the wives of the male orgeones." It seems, however, perfectly clear that only adult males were orgeones. I take γυναιξί to mean, not wives, but the women (of the orgeones) generally as, for example, in Plato, Phaed., 116B, 117D; Ditt. Syll.[2] 552, 46 = Syll.[3] 695; 589, 45 = Syll.[3] 1004 (cf. Aristoph. Peace, 962 ff.). They get κρέα only when the animal sacrificed is an ox. The portions are then specified for the several classes of women, αἱ ἐλεύθεραι, αἱ θυγατέρες, and αἱ ἀκόλουθοι. Excluding the second and third classes, αἱ ἐλεύθεραι comprise the wives, widows, and spinsters (possibly aunts and married daughters) of the orgeonic families. The choice of ἐλεύθεραι as the designation of this class was probably prescribed by the wish to distinguish it from the ἀκόλουθοι, who were commonly, though not always, slaves (Westermann, PWK Suppl. VI 913 f.). It would exclude hetairai, as it does in Athen. XIII, 571 D. But in Theophr. Char. XI 2 γυναιξὶν ἐλευθέραις means simply "respectable women" as does γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρας in Theopompus (Jacoby,

one female attendant (for each matron) a portion not exceeding a half. [He shall deliver] the portion of the woman to the man (i.e., husband, guardian, master)."

The decree is designated as "ancient" (*ἀρχαῖον*), and it has the crisp style, with parataxis, characteristic of the middle fifth century B.C. It also uses the word *ἰσαῖος*, which, apart from one appearance [19] in the Laws of the Milesian Molpoi (Ditt. Syll.[3] 57, 10) dated in 450/49 B.C., is, according to Liddell-Scott-Jones, a late poetical form of *ἴσος*. It seems to have been in usage in the middle of the fifth century B.C. in texts dealing with the distribution of sacrificial meats. In our third century B.C. context it was undoubtedly an archaism. The ancient decree is unquestionably the oldest official record of orgeones to come into our possession.

From the ordinance of the early third century in which the publication of "the ancient decrees" was ordered we learn that the orgeones consisted of two distinct associations (*κοινά*) — one of the hero Echelos, the more important of the two obviously, and the other of the Heroines "whose locale was near the property of Kalliphanes." [20] Their union for purposes of common sacrifices ([*τῶν θυσιῶν ἡ κοινω*]*νία*, cf. below, p. 156 and n. 56) was of long standing,[21] and measures were taken in the

FGH II B 115, 143); and in Menander (Frg. 546, Kock) *ἐλευθέρᾳ γυναικί* may be translated with propriety "lady"; cf. A. W. Gomme, Essays in Greek History and Literature, 99; in Plato, Laws, 937 A, as often, *γυναικὶ ἐλευθέρᾳ* is contrasted with *δούλῃ καὶ δούλῳ*. The name *εὐγενεῖς* was not available since it was appropriate primarily for the womenfolk of gennetai (cf. Roussel, Mélanges Bidez, 819 ff.; Hesperia, 1938, 51 ff.). An instructive parallel to our text is to be found in IG XII 5, 667, a document from Syros, ante 251 A.D.: *γυναιξὶ δὲ καὶ παρθένοις ἐλευθέραις πάσαις καὶ ταῖς τῶν στεφανηφόρων θεραπαινίσιν - - - κρέως χοιρείου* (λιτρ.) *ἀ* (cf. id. 659, 663, 665 and F. Puttkammer, 54 ff.).

[19] *Τῇ δὲ ἐνάτῃ· καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀσφύος καὶ τῆς πεμπάδος ἣν ἴσχοσιν στεφανηφόροι, τούτων προλαγχάνει τὰ ἰσῆα ὁ νέος.* As Wilamowitz pointed out (S. B. Preuss. Akad. 1904, 623 f.), *ἰσῆα* = Attic *ἰσαῖα*. He defines it *ἐπ' ἴσῃ καὶ ὁμοίᾳ*. Hesychius (s.v.) says: *μερίς. οἱ δέ, ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἴση μοῖρα.* Of its connotation Wilamowitz remarks: "Darin liegt, dass es nicht dasselbe zu sein braucht, *τὰ ἴσα*, sondern gleichwertig."

[20] The genitive in the phrase *πρὸς τοῖς Καλλιφάνους* could also be derived from *Καλλιφανώ*, an assumed heroine, the chief perhaps of the Heroines; but the closest analogy known to me, *Χλόῃ παρὰ τὰ Μειδύλου* (IG II[2] 1358, 49) makes the masculine preferable.

[21] The probability is that it was consummated at the time the ancient decrees were enacted, i.e. ca. 450 B.C. Otherwise, why did the ancient decrees have such authority?

early third century to insure that it endure "for all time." The mover of this decree, Lysias, son of Periandros, of Plotheia, was an Athenian citizen — a member of a known family.[22]

What do we learn from the "ancient decree" itself? The orgeones consist of the adult males. They alone participate in the decree-making body and they are the principals in the sacrifice. Their sons as the orgeones-to-be shared in the sacrificial feast on all occasions, but their portions of the flesh of the victims were half, or, according to their age, less than half of the portions given to their seniors. Two full-grown victims were sacrificed to the Hero on consecutive days in July of every year; but it was contemplated that the funds at the disposal of the association might not suffice to purchase an ox, but only a less expensive animal like a sheep or a goat, for either or even both days of sacrifice. When there was no ox there was no meat for the womenfolk of the orgeones; when there was, the adult females of citizen status received share and share alike with the orgeones while their daughters and maidservants were given portions on the same basis as their sons. The chances are, I think, that the women stayed at home on the day or days when there was no ox unless their greater piety, or desire for company, and the encouragement maybe of a basket led them to be present anyway.[23] A case is reported by Pausanias (VIII 48, 5) in which the women monopolized the flesh of a victim and denied a share to the men.

The size of the portions depended upon the amount of meat available and the number of participants, and consequently was incapable of advance definition. Naturally it could not be made so small as to satisfy nobody. We have it on record

[22] His deme, Plotheia, was one of the inland demes of Aigeis, located by Milchhoefer (P. W. II, 2203) north of Pentelikon near Ikaria. Of course he need not have lived in his deme.

[23] Isocrates (VII 29) affirms by clear implication that a *heorte* possessed superior attractiveness when it was accompanied by a *hestiasis*. The reunions of the orgeones of Echelos and the Heroines followed immediately after the national trieteric fête of the Synoikia which was celebrated on Hekatombaion 16th on the Akropolis (Class. Stud. Capps, 155). On the same day, beginning perhaps in 374 B.C., an annual sacrifice of something like 200 animals was made to Eirene (IG II^2 1496, lines 94, 127). The orgeones (men only) of Echelos who came to the *asty* for these fêtes may have stayed over-night, for their own fête, in the temenos, which probably had at least one dwelling house.

that the flesh of one good ox sufficed to provide portions for the fifty prytaneis, the nine archons, the (ten) hieropoioi, and an undefined number of pompeis (IG II² 47, 35 ff., ca. 350 B.C.). Absent orgeones received nothing and the same was doubtless true of absent sons and womenfolk. The provision that the women's portions should be delivered to the men was probably designed to aid the Host in distributing the meat among those present. The Host was obviously one of the orgeones, and his post an assignment which rotated among them in some settled order.

The objects of worship are specifically a hero and heroines, yet in making the sacrifices the orgeones violate every provision of the ritual normal in the cult of the dead (below, p. 165).

On the *stele* on which the "ancient decree" was inscribed, in the lost lower portion, the names of the debtors of the association together with the amount of capital owed and the accrued interest were posted. Had this account been preserved we should probably be able to make some inferences as to the funds of the association, their investment, and the annual yield in interest (*τὰ ἐπιγενόμενα*, line 24). As it is, we know nothing about its finances, except the fact that they were in such a state as to require a permanent record of the association's investments to be made and published. A definite basis for a fresh start was thus laid. Assuming, as we may, that one ox, one sheep and one suckling pig were normally sacrificed each year the income cannot have been less than 90 drachmas. The group of families was probably small.[24] Only one table was set up.[25] A cautious inference as to their social position is permissible from the provision that one female attendant [26] per matron was allowed to receive meat. The presumption that each

[24] The orgeones of Egretes numbered from 12 to 30, those of Asklepios from Prospalta 16, and those of Dionysos 15. Cf. below, pp. 80, 91, 117.

[25] The orgeones of Egretes (below, p. 80) had "tables." For the possible meanings of *τράπεζα* see n. 27. Here it may mean either *mensa sacra* or serving table.

[26] For male attendants (slaves) at the Mysteries see IG I² 6, 52; and others, possibly female, IG II² 4970 = Ziehen, Leges Sacrae, II 1, 20. Cf. id. 70, l. 3, Theophr. Char. IX 3, and above, n. 18. The practices envisaged in Theophr. Char. IX 3 and XXX 16 of getting more than one's share by collusion with one's slaves may explain why the portions of the maidservants were rationed.

mater familias would be accompanied by a maidservant shows that as a group the women belonged to respectable, fairly well-to-do families, which could and did observe the social conventions of the time. Even the mean-spirited man (Theophr. Char. XXII 10), who denied his wife a maid notwithstanding that she had brought him a dowry, hired a slave girl so that she should not be unaccompanied when she appeared in public processions. The proprieties were important for people who could afford them. The denial of meat to more than one attendant implies that there were families in the group which had the means to come to the reunion with two or more maidservants. The possession by the orgeones of female slave attendants is conclusive evidence that they did not belong to the class of the "poor" (ἄποροι). The poor had to use their wives and daughters to perform the services for which the well-to-do employed female slaves, because, says Aristotle, "they had no slaves" (διὰ τὴν ἀδουλίαν, Arist. Pol. IV 15, 13, p. 1300a; VI 8, 23, p. 1323a. Cf. Ferguson, Hell. Ath. 85, Newman, The Politics of Aristotle, IV 567 f., and Westermann, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. Suppl. Vol. I, 1940, 468 f.).

The associated orgeones of the Heroines and Echelos had a sacred precinct with an altar (lines 6 f.) in which the sacrifices were made and the reunions of the orgeones were held. Consequently sacrifices were accepted by either Echelos or the Heroines, or both, in a hieron to which he or they were not indigenous (cf. n. 15). This association was a bicellular organism like the genos of the Salaminioi. In the case discussed under no. (6) the split of the orgeones was probably based simply on a disagreement as to policy, since the cult was centered in a single "Goddess." In general the orgeones seem to have been isolated unicellular groups. The two associations of orgeones of Bendis were independent of each other and united only to participate jointly in the spectacular part of the Bendideia. The orgeones of the Mother of the Gods (no. 14) were obviously *sui generis*.

(2) The text from the Areopagus did not call for a description of the sacred precinct and we have no further information

about it. We may, however, form a picture of a sacred precinct of orgeones by drawing on a record of another old Attic association of this type. We have in our possession a lease, executed in 306/05 B.C. by the orgeones of the hero Egretes (IG II^2 2499). The stone from which it comes was found in Athens at the foot of the Hill of the Nymphs. These orgeones let their sacred precinct for ten years to a certain Diognetos, son of Arkesilos, of Melite. The terms of the lease are informative as to the nature and equipment of the property. The rental was 200 drachmas per year, payable to the treasurer in two equal semi-annual installments. There were buildings and fruit trees — probably olive trees — in the precinct, the buildings being roofless and doorless. During the period of the lease the precinct remained a precinct, available for unimpeded use by the orgeones for their sacred purposes. The tenant had the obligation of keeping the walls stuccoed and otherwise repaired, of caring for the trees and replacing any that died; but he was permitted to add and, on the expiring of the lease, remove roof and doors. The orgeones met for their annual sacrifices to Egretes in the month of Boedromion (September) and on this occasion Diognetos had to put at their disposal with the doors open the dwelling house in which was the cella (called a hieron, not a heroon), the roasting place or kitchen, an improvised shed or shelter (cf. Ditt. Syll.^{2} II 937, n., 4 and 13 = Syll.^{3} III 1097, n. 3 and 11; Ziehen, Leges Sacrae II 1, 79 n.), dining couches and tables large enough for two triclinia, i.e., for 12–30 persons.[27]

[27] Τράπεζα means ordinarily in ritualistic records the *mensa sacra* on which were placed the offerings intended for the gods (cf. Aristoph. Plutus, 676 ff.); but in IG II^2 1358 it means the *mensa domestica* on which, according to Ziehen, the portions assigned to the priests were placed. Here τράπεζαι must also mean *mensae domesticae*, but the viands placed on them must be those which the orgeones ate (cf. Ziehen, 123 f., n. 5). Εἰς δύο τρίκλινα is, I take it, a definition of capacity. If the couches and tables were part of the permanent equipment of the shrine, κλίνας καὶ τραπέζας would have been preceded by the article and their capacity would not have needed to be a matter of contractual arrangement. For the seating capacity of a τρίκλινον see PWK VII 1203 and 2te Reihe, XIII 95; Blümner, The Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, 205. It is commonly stated that the Greeks ordinarily reclined two on a *kline*, but Professor G. H. Chase informs me that "a series of vases of the late fifth century style certainly shows anywhere from two to five. There is a fairly good series published in E. M. W. Tillyard, The Hope Vases. For instance, Hope 152 (published on Plate 25) shows two; Hope 303 (= Tisch-

The letting of the shrine may be taken as evidence of thrift and good management rather than of financial distress (cf. IG I² 94).

In this record of the orgeones of Egretes is made explicit what is implicit in the "ancient" decree of the orgeones of Echelos and the Heroines — that the flesh of the sacrificial animals was not only divided, but roasted and consumed on the spot. Absentees, whether male or female, might enjoy the spiritual benefits of the sacrifice, but not the material; and their enjoyment of the intangible benefits was contingent on these being vouchsafed to those who did not partake of the sacrificial meats. Doubtless here, as in civic and other cultus generally, all that mattered was the performance of the rite. Again we have evidence for the observance of decorum, of orderly feasting, of shelter from the sun or rain, and of economic well-being.

(3) We have another orgeonic record, in which orgeones of the "god" Hypodektes leased their shrine to a citizen and his descendants for all time with a rental of 50 drachmas per annum (IG II² 2501, end of fourth cent. B.C.). The stone bearing the lease was found in "the western part of the city of Athens." The lessees in this case had not only to keep the premises (temenos, hieron, oikia), stipulated to remain a hieron, open on the occasion of the annual reunion of the orgeones (14th of Boedromion, the day on which the hiera were brought from Eleusis as a preliminary to the Eleusinian Mysteries which ran from the 15th to the 23rd), but they had also to have the shrine garlanded at daybreak on the day of the fête and the cult image oiled and unveiled.[28] What is obvious in the case of the

bein, Collection of Engravings from Ancient Vases now in the Possession of Sir William Hamilton, III pl. 10) shows three men on a couch with a woman sitting on the end of it; Hope 165 (= Tischbein, II pl. 55) shows four; and Hope 154 (which is not published) is described as having five men on the couch" (cf. Cic. In Pis. 67). R. Zahn in Buschor, Furtwängler-Reichhold, Griech. Vasenmalerei, Series 3, p. 192, Abb. 96, has three persons on a couch. The number per *kline* was probably less the more the occasion was formal or sumptuous (cf. Macrobius, Saturnalia, III 13, 11). The *mensae sacrae* were "grosse altarförmige massive Basen" (Stengel, Opferbräuche, 208, n. 1). It is to be noted that it was on the side of a τράπεζα of this description that No. (10) (below, p. 93) was cut.

[28] Instead of (καθ') ἡμέρα[ν] in line 8 something else should be restored. The

orgeones of Echelos and the Heroines is explicitly disclosed in this instance — they had archives of their own in which they kept their records.

Hypodektes is named ὁ θεός in line 22 of the inscription (cf. also ll. 8 f.). Koehler (IG II¹ 1061) classifies him as "a god or hero." He was obviously one of the deities "in a small way" who, like the Hero Iatros in IG II² 839 ll. 33, 45 and 840 ll. 6, 14, is given the honorific appellation θεός (cf. Poland, 212 f., and below, pp. 85, 163 ff.).

(4) An orgeonic decree of ca. 300 B.C. is published by Meritt in Hesperia X (1941), 56 f. It was enacted on the motion of a certain Mnesigeiton and conferred honors on a certain Mnesarchos. Meritt's remark, "The formulae imply that Mnesarchos probably was not an Athenian, for his goodwill toward the Athenian demos holds a prominent place in the motivating clauses of the decree," seems to me to lack cogency. The attitude of citizen-members to the Athenian demos is cited by phyletai (IG II² 1148, 1163) and demotai (IG II² 1194, 1201, 1214) as a consideration reënforcing services to themselves as a basis for grants of honors. It is in the records of civic groups like these rather than in those of alien thiasotai that parallels valid for orgeones are to be sought. In view of the interrelations of families characteristic of orgeones and best attested in IG II² 2355 (cf. No. (8), p. 91 below) I venture to suggest that Mnesarchos was a relative of Mnesigeiton. The stone containing this decree is broken away at the bottom so that we do not know in what capacity Mnesarchos served the association. He may have been Host (*hestiator*). He was, I take it, a citizen of some distinction. The fragment does not mention the patron of the cult. Hence these orgeones may be identical with one or other of the associations included in our list, if the use by them of the shorter form of the name is not a decisive distinctive.

The most remarkable novelty in this decree is that the association called itself a koinon [ὀ]ργέων [the dative plural may have been ὀργεῦσι, quite as well as ὀργεῶσι, since the word is restored]. Ὀργέων is the genitive plural of *ὀργεύς, an unattested variant of ὀργεών. Its genitive plural occurred, "instead of ὀργεώνων," according to Harpocration (s.v. ὀργέων), in a lost speech of Lysias (Frg. 112 ed. Sauppe). Moreover, it is found in the Eudemian Ethics of Aristotle (1241b, 25), where it has been substituted by J. Solomon (Oxford Translation, IX 2), properly as now appears, for the Mss. reading ὀργίων, which is hardly tolerable. The passage runs as follows, "The other partnerships are [either] (retaining ἤ which Solomon brackets) a part of the civic partnership, e.g. those of the phratries and priestly colleges, or pecuniary

Arcadian peasant who, according to Delphi, excelled all others in piety wreathed and polished the images of Hermes and Hekate *once a month* (Theopompus, ap. Porphyr. De abst. II 16 = Jacoby, FGH II B 115, 344). The stone is lost. Rangabe's transcript shows ἡμέραι. Before ἡμέραι he read only ΔΔΔΙ. Probably we should restore ἅμα ἡμέραι, assuming that Rangabe read the top corners of mu as two letters and gave a space to the right upright of the second alpha.

partnerships" (*αἱ δ' ἄλλαι κοινωνίαι εἰσὶν ἢ μόριον τῶν τῆς πόλεως, οἷον ἡ τῶν φρατέρων ἢ τῶν ὀργέων, ἢ αἱ χρηματιστικαί*). I have given Solomon's translation, but I believe that "sacrificing associates" comes nearer to the meaning of *ὀργέων* than "priestly colleges." The writer of the Eudemian Ethics obviously thought of the orgeones as a civic institution and not of the type of free associations (Nock). It is possible that the genitive plural *ὀργέων* is also found in Aeschylus, frg. 144 (see below, Appendix 1). On the relation to each other of the two forms Professor Whatmough has very kindly given me the following note: "The evidence for the gen. pl. *ὀργέων* beside the nom. sg. *ὀργεών* (gen. pl. *ὀργεώνων*) is beyond question irrefragable. The question is: what is the relation of these forms to one another? The poetical *ὀργειών* provides conclusive evidence; for the acc. pl. *ὀργείονας* (so W. Schulze, Quaest. Epicae, 255, rightly, for *ὀργτονας*) at *h. Ap.* 389 indicates a stem *ὀργηον-* (whence Attic *ὀργεων-*), and that in its turn indicates a stem *ὀργηϝ-*, nom. sg. **ὄργευς*, gen. pl. *ὀργέων*." A precise analogy for **ὀργεύς — ὀργεών* is *τοκεύς — τοκεών*, as Professor Werner Jaeger has pointed out to me.

(5) Among the creditors of a fugitive condemned for sacrilege are listed in the accounts of the poletai for 367/66 B.C. (*a*) Kichonides, son of Diogeiton, of Gargettos and the koinon of 'phrateres Medontidai,' and (*b*) Aeschines of Melite and the koinon of orgeones. The latter had taken a mortgage on the delinquent's house for 24 drachmas. Miss Margaret Crosby, who has published these records (Hesperia, X (1941) 14 ff.), argues that the koinon of orgeones was a thiasos of the Medontidai since otherwise they would have been nameless and unidentifiable. I question the validity of this argument. The Attic orgeones have an irritating way of being anonymous. The deity they worshipped is titular for the orgeones in two instances only (Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion, and Herakles at Kome in Lemnos). In all other cases, they are individualized only by matter entered, mostly incidentally, in the body of their records. Normally the orgeones are *οἱ ὀργεῶνες* simply. There is therefore no reason to associate the orgeones of the proceedings of the poletai with the phratry of the Medontidai. They are there designated with all reasonable precision by the name of the one of the group (Aeschines of Melite) who entered on their behalf the *episkepsis* which succeeded in saving for them their investment. Aeschines was probably the chief of the orgeones for the year (*hestiator*), or he may have been an advocate (*synegoros*; cf. IG II² 1183, 1258, and Mélanges Glotz, 350 ff.) chosen by the orgeones to act for them in the judicial proceedings. Incidentally it is wholly by the name of a similar individual that the phrateres of IG II² 2723 are identified in this mortgage record. Regularly a single name sufficed in the decisive records to define who the eranistai were who loaned money on the security of real property (IG II² 2699, 2700, 2701, 2719). In the same way the orgeones of IG II² 1294 (below, No. (11)) were probably distinguished by the name of their head. We do not know to whom the shrine was consecrated in which the orgeones of 367/66 B.C. sacrificed and held their reunions. The hero or god is normally titular for the shrine. Naturally the poletai had no occasion to mention either it or him. In the circumstances we have no means of determining whether this decree belongs to one of the associations already known and listed in this article or to a new association.

(6) There is yet another orgeonic record which after some hesitation I attribute to the same class as those thus far considered. IG II² 1289 (early third century B.C.) was inscribed in letters carefully arranged *stoichedon* on a stone which is broken away at top and bottom. Yet enough is preserved to show that it contained a record of the proceedings of a trial before Athenian private arbitrators.[29] The case arose out of a dispute between one group of the orgeones and another. The object of the cult is simply "the Goddess." The arbitrators decided that the property of the Goddess could not be disposed of by sale or hypothecation, and that its revenue must be used for the sacrifices which the priest was to offer to her with the participation of the orgeones. The fragmentary lines at the top of the stone indicate that both disputants had agreed under oath to accept the findings of the arbitrators (cf. Hesperia, VII, 47 ff.), but nonetheless "the Goddess," who is nameless, through the mouth of a certain Kallistratos, solemnly interdicted any orgeon (ὀ[ρ]γ[εώνα])[30] from alienating any of her property or diverting any of her income from her sacrifices.[31]

Since the stone was found in Athens, at the church of St. Irene, and not in the Piraeus, it is most improbable that "the Goddess" was Bendis, or the Mother of the Gods, or Hagne Aphrodite, or any other deity localized in the harbor town. The interdict begins: ἀπαγορεύει δὲ καὶ ἡ θεὸς κ[αὶ . . . . ⁹ . . . . . Καλλίστρατος, κτλ. If the goddess had had a name we should expect it to be given to her in a prohibition of this character. The alternative is that she was simply "the Goddess," as a hero is simply "the Hero" (cf. above, p. 74, n. 15). In Attica ἡ θεός might be Athena; but as Poland (175, 183) has pointed

[29] Orgeones were defendants in a suit in which Isaeus wrote the speech (cited several times by Harpokration) for the plaintiff. The action "appears to have been concerned with the possession of a piece of land"; Forster in Loeb Classics, 456; Thalheim, Frg. 112–113. They also figured in some way or other in a process regarding an inheritance so as to be mentioned by Lysias in the speech which he wrote for one of the litigants (Harpokration s.v. ὀργέων). Perhaps they were called on to give evidence as to legitimacy of birth or adoption.

[30] The only instance of the singular found in the inscriptions.

[31] The submission of the case to arbitrators and the measures taken to insure execution of their findings suggest that it was thought possible to dispose of the property of an association of orgeones and thus, perhaps, disband the association itself.

out, Athena (without a specifying epithet) was never the object of the cult of Attic private associations. Hence she is not to be thought of in this instance. The title of Kallistratos is lost, but, allowing one space for the article, it had precisely eight letters. Wilamowitz suggested *προφήτης* and Kirchner has so restored the text in IG II^2; but, however plausible this may seem at first glance, it does not meet the case — the issuance in the form of an order of the findings of a court. Moreover, we do not find a *προφήτης* on the staff of any association of orgeones. The only title with eight letters which *is* found in the orgeonic records is *ἑστιάτωρ*.[32] Strictly the name Kallistratos is unnecessary; but, since it was undoubtedly Kallistratos himself who formulated the interdict, it accords with Athenian practice for him to insert his own name in the text. Moreover, the prohibition envisaged a situation which was immediately acute. Kallistratos had to handle it. The insertion of the title *hestiator* sufficed to transfer the responsibility to his successors should the occasion arise. When, however, *hestiator* is restored in our text, IG II^2 1289 takes its place in our Class A — and then Class A includes not only orgeones of heroes but also orgeones of "a Goddess." My initial hesitation to include it in this category sprang in part from the designation of the object of cult as "the Goddess" — a hesitation that is removed when "the Goddess" is regarded as simply a honorific synonym for "the Heroine" (cf. above p. 82 and below 162 ff.); it sprang also in part from the fact that these orgeones had a priest. Nowhere else is a priest associated with a Host in our official records.[33] There is, indeed, an historical notice in the Vita of

[32] Nock noticed that *ἐξηγητής* has the required number of letters. I think, however, that an exegetes had no place in this transaction. The content of the prohibition had just been formulated in an arbitral decision. There was nothing to expound. The Goddess appears *in propria persona* because she had been declared the owner of the property which the interdict was designed to protect. Once the priest is excluded — the name *ἱερεύς* is too short for the space — the proper person to be associated with her in a prohibition addressed to the orgeones was the chief executive official of the association which administered her property. That was the *hestiator*. I do not think that we have to imagine, as in the case, for example, of the *prostagmata* of non-Greek deities, an epiphany of the Goddess in a dream or vision. She appears in the text simply as a property owner.

[33] Poland (352), following Koerte (l.c., 297), wrongly identifies a public priest of Asklepios (IG II^2 4457, second half of second century B.C.) as a priest of the

Sophocles, 11, which, as restored by Koerte (Ath. Mitt. XXI, 1896, 311; cf. Berl. Phil. Woch. 1925, 1412 f.),[34] is to the effect that Sophocles held the priesthood, a lifelong priesthood seemingly, of the hero Amynos. Yet the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion were, as we shall see, headed by two Hosts. There is a possibility that the priest of "the Goddess" was a life-long priest like Sophocles and Agathokles and Dionysios (below, No. (15)), and another that, like the treasurer of No. (2), he was an orgeon designated annually to assist the *hestiator*. We have no evidence which enables us to choose between the two.

(7) In another orgeonic record (IG II² 1259) dated in 313/12 B.C. — one of a group of three decrees (1252, after the middle of the fourth century B.C., 1253, same date, and 1259) of the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion — two Hosts (*histiatores*) are mentioned. Like others connected with this association they were members of known families (Koerte, l.c., 307). Their functions are briefly described as "management of the association's affairs and sacrifices." Two other individuals (brothers) appear in 1252 as deserving praise for attending to the association's affairs. Their office is not given

---

orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion; cf. Dinsmoor, Archons of Athens, 288. IG II² 4385 and 4424 (as well as 4457) record votive offerings to Amynos.

[34] Despite the hesitation of v. Blumenthal (PWK 2te Reihe V 1044 f.) and Wilamowitz (Glaube der Hellenen, II 224 f.) and the refusal of E. Schmidt (Ath. Mitt. 1913 73 ff.) Fr. Pfister (Der Reliquienkult im Altertum, 121 n. 434) and Otto Kern (Rel. d. Hellenen, II 314, n. 1) to accept Koerte's substitution of AMYNOY for the Mss. reading ΑΛΩΝΟΣ, I think that the change is sustained by the weight of the facts and presents no real palaeographical difficulties. Sophocles is certainly connected with Amynos. It is most unlikely that he was simultaneously priest of another, potentially rival, Asklepian hero, of whom, moreover, there is no trace among the many ex-votos found in the Amyneion and the Asklepieion in Athens. In an unfamiliar proper name some copyist misread μυ as λω (an easy enough thing to do, cf. GGA 1903, 843), preserving a six letter word; and no later copyist knew enough to suspect an error. What might happen is shown by what did happen in an analogous case. Θεόδοτος Διοδώρου Σουνιεύς (IG II² 1011, 106/05 B.C.; cf. Ferguson, Hell. Ath. 426; John Day, An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination, 86 f.) became, through a scribal error, Θεοδόσιος (var. Διονύσιος) Θεοδώρου Σουνιεύς in the Attic decree of the same year transmitted by Josephus, Antiq. Jud. XIV 8, 5, and the name of the secretary, Εὐκλῆς Ξενάνδρου Αἰθα[λίδη]ς, became Εὐκλῆς Μενάνδρου Ἀλιμούσιος.

but it is a fair inference that they were also Hosts and the same is doubtless true of the two men honored in 1253, a badly mutilated document. As Koerte pointed out, among the members of this association were persons of considerable standing in the community (were not Sophocles, the great tragedian, general, and Hellenic Treasurer, and Iophon, his distinguished son, of their number?), while the association itself did not lack funds: it voted two gold crowns on one occasion, each to cost 500 drachmas. There is no trace of any non-citizen in its records or in any of the orgeonic records thus far discussed. The orgeones known to us were quite respectable Athenians, preponderantly persons of the propertied classes.

This association had two shrines, one of Amynos and Asklepios, and one of Dexion (IG II² 1252). Its history is well known since Alfred Koerte in a brilliant article (Ath. Mitt. XXI 287 ff.) reconstructed it in 1896. The orgeones of the hero Amynos were an ancient association reaching back to the sixth century B.C. and beyond. They extended their cult to include Asklepios after his migration from Epidauros to the Piraeus and to Athens in 420 B.C. (IG II² 4960), and later (after 406/05 B.C.) they admitted Dexion, the Receiver, the hero into whom they transformed Sophocles after his death.[35] Asklepios

[35] Cf. also Foucart, Le culte des Héros chez les grecs, 121 ff., 125, and F. R. Walton, Harvard Studies in Class. Phil. XLVI (1935), 170 ff. The hieron of Dexion was, I think, a memorial chapel. It was constructed, according to our best source, the Vita of Sophocles (11) (cf. Jahn-Michaelis, Sophoclis Electra, 1 ff.), by Iophon, his son, with the concurrence necessarily of the orgeones (cf. IG II² 1326). The Etym. Mag. s.v. Δεξίων reports (*φασίν*) that "the Athenians" constructed a heroon for Sophocles and named him Dexion, and Istros mentions a decree passed by them ordaining the offering of a sacrifice (*θύειν*) to him every year (FHG I, p. 425). It is probable in the case of the lexicographer, and intelligible in the case of Istros, a non-Athenian who can hardly be expected to have had personal familiarity with the jurisdiction of the orgeones and is responsible for several erroneous statements in the Vita of Sophocles, that an enactment of the association was conceived to be an act of the Athenian state. Sophocles was buried in the tomb of his ancestors on the road to Deceleia, eleven stades from the wall of the city (Vita, 15). That, if anywhere, was the place for a heroon; but our report is so circumstantial that it seems excluded that he received heroic honors at his tomb; and a public heroizing of the poet at the time of his death is incredible both on general grounds and in view of the negative evidence of Aristophanes' Frogs. Foucart (125) seems to me to have interpreted the transaction correctly: "Il était donc impossible aux Orgéons d'installer dans leur chapelle un

entered the hieron of Amynos, Dexion received a shrine of his own — a small chapel abutting on the main hieron — so that the orgeones, who remained undivided, though possibly not unenlarged, came to possess two sacred precincts. Since they held annual reunions in each shrine on distinct dates (IG II² 1252, line 11) they had two Hosts instead of one after ca. 406 B.C.

The story of Dexion can be pieced together from our various sources to run as follows. According to the temple-chronicle of the urban Asklepieion (IG II² 4960) compiled by Telemachos of Acharnai, who was chiefly instrumental in founding and equipping it, Asklepios "came up from Zea (the little harbor) at the time of the Great Mysteries (420 B.C.) and entered the Eleusinion." This statement undoubtedly rests on an epiphany of Asklepios (cf. Plut. Non posse suaviter vivi, 22, p. 1103 B), which revealed his presence not only in Athens but also in the Piraeus. What follows chronicles a bit of human history, reminiscent of the Pisistratus-Phye legend: "He (Asklepios) sent for, and brought, in a chariot, from Epidaurus, a snake (cf. Paus. II 28), (his own living symbol) while Telemachos stood by his side" (Τηλ[ε]μάχο[υ π]α[ραστάντο]ς — my restoration), and drove the horses (Wilamowitz, Glaube der Hellenen, II 222, 223, 1). The snake was presumably in a box or jar. A precise parallel to this incident is reported by Pausanias (II 10, 3): "The Sicyonians say that the god (Asklepios) was carried to them from Epidaurus on a carriage drawn by two mules, that he was in the likeness of a serpent, and that he was brought

---

Héros apellé Sophocle. Ils eurent l'idée, me semble-t-il, de le dédoubler et de tirer de lui une personnalité fictive qu'ils désignèrent, comme on le fit souvent pour les Héros, non par son nom, mais par un surnom. Et ce surnom, Δεξίων, le montrait accomplissant l'acte de piété le plus glorieux pour lui-même et pour la confrérie, l'accueil fait à une divinité nouvelle venue à Athènes." In the Greek cult of the Ptolemies the deified rulers were defined by their epithets as Soteres, Euergetai, Philadelphoi, etc., Alexander the Great alone being a god in his own name (Wilcken, GGA 1895 141 n. 1). Fr. Pfister (Reliquienkult, 121 n. 435) rejects the interpretation of Dexion given by Etym. Mag. (ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ δεξιώσεως), and substitutes for it one of his own, "natürlich hat der Heilgott seinen Namen nach der heilenden *rechten* Hand." This gesture of the outstretched right hand was, however, too constant a feature of the iconography of Greek deities (cf. e.g. below, 102, 109, n. 52) to be name-giving for any one of them.

by Nicagora of Sicyon, the mother of Agasicles and the wife of Echetimus" (Trans. by W. H. S. Jones, Loeb Classics). For similar transplantings of Asklepios in the form of a snake see Paus. III 23, 6; Livy, Epit. XI. On the arrival of Telemachos in Athens, the Asklepieion was not yet constructed: its inauguration was delayed by a claim of the Kerykes to the projected site (419 B.C.).[36] In view of the opposition of the Eleusinian

[36] The Eleusinion was situated on the north-west slope of the Acropolis (Wachsmuth, PW V 2335; Shear, Hesperia, VIII, 207; IX 268). It had been enclosed so completely that in 431 B.C. it could be kept free from refugees (Thucy. II 17, 1). Thus its delimitation (ὁρισμός) was effected much earlier than 420 B.C. The Eleusinion cannot have had frontier troubles in 419 B.C. We have nothing but the counter-claim of the Kerykes to the site ([τὸ χ]ωρίο, IG II 4960, l. 15) projected for the Asklepieion to lead us to suppose (cf. Hiller, IG I², p. 293; Wilamowitz, Glaube der Hellenen, II 223) that the partisans of Asklepios proposed to encroach on, i.e., take a portion of, the Eleusinion for the new god. That is not enough. The Kerykes may easily have contested his establishment in the area on the south slope of the Acropolis in which the Asklepieion was constructed for good, though unknown, reasons. Since the Asklepieion was initially a private hieron (cf. Robert Schlaifer, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. 1940, 240; Class. Phil. 1943, 40, n. 13), equipped largely, if not exclusively, by Telemachos at his own expense, the Kerykes may have represented simply the public interest. In Rome Asklepios was brought from Epidaurus in 293 B.C. because of a pestilence (Livy Epit. XI). The background for his importation by Athens was undoubtedly the Great Plague, the occasion the Peace of Nikias, which gave again to the Athenians access to Epidauros between 421 and 419 B.C. It is conceivable that there were Athenians who thought that a shrine in the Piraeus was sufficient; but it is intelligible that others, mindful of the horrors of 430–427 B.C., thought it wise to leave nothing undone to secure the aid of the god of healing. The Kerykes were necessarily participants in the action taken (by the state?) in establishing the Epidauria, a fête intercalated in the middle of the Great Mysteries to celebrate the day (fixed as Boedromion 18) of Asklepios' arrival in the Eleusinion; and, regarding this outstanding public recognition as completely adequate, they may have sought to head off projects for founding private hiera of the god in the *asty*. From ancient times there were many little shrines and altars of gods and heroes on the slopes of the Acropolis (Broneer, Hesperia, II 346, 415 ff., IV 118 ff., VIII 428). The stretch west of the theatre of Dionysos can hardly have been an exception (cf. Judeich, Top. von Athen,² 320, n. 3). In it were two springs (IG I² 874, 875), and to it may have descended in ancient times a path from the top of the citadel. The Kerykes would doubtless have had specific grounds for intervention if an altar or shrine of Demeter, for example, existed in this area. We do not know at what moment the state took over the Asklepieion and created a public priesthood of Asklepios. It may have been at the time, whatever that is (post 412/11 B.C. in any case), at which the temple-chronicle of Telemachos ended. The earliest known public priest is dated by Pritchett and Meritt (The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, 75) at about 360 B.C.

genos the Eleusinion was hardly available for the reptile. Sophocles, a man of equal kindliness, piety, and distinction, whose interest in Asklepios was well known — he composed a paean in his honor (IG II² 4510) —, and whom a tradition preserved by Plutarch connects with the epiphany, stepped into the breach and "received" the snake in his own house (*ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ οἰκίᾳ*, Etym. Mag. l. c.; cf. Plut. Numa, IV 6; Wilhelm Schmid, Gesch. d. griech. Lit. I 2 320, n. 1), thus assuming the function of "receptionist" which at a later date Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica, the *vir optimus in civitate* in the judgment of the Senate, performed on the arrival in Rome of the Black Stone which symbolized *Magna Mater* (Livy, XXIX 10, 14, Graillot, Le culte de Cybèle, 51 ff.). It has been thought that the *οἰκία* was in the Amyneion, but the text excludes this. An Arcadian decree (IG V 2 265, lines 21 ff.) shows how easy it came to the Greeks to use a private house as a sacristy: "furthermore she (the priestess) received the goddess (Kore) in her own house as is the custom for those who successively become priests" (*[ὑ]πεδέξατο δὲ καὶ τὰν θεὸν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν οἰκίαν καθώς ἐστιν ἔθος τοῖς [ἀ]ε[ὶ] γινομένοις ἱερεῦσιν*). It was doubtless more convenient for Sophocles to give the serpent of Asklepios tendance, including sustenance and an altar, in his own house than in the precinct of Amynos, where moreover, even though he was priest, his presence was so rarely required that the snake would have been less safe. It is a precious detail to find the idol of the Athenians, then a genial, serene, dignified graybeard, conversant with, but untroubled by, the moral and religious contradictions of his great age, doling out eggs to a sacred snake and sacrificing cocks to Asklepios on a domestic altar. The orgeones did their bit by associating the newly arrived god with the old hero in their cult. Once the Asklepieion was ready Sophocles was naturally rid of his charge. After his death and his heroization by the orgeones as Dexion, Telemachos, whose services tended to be eclipsed by those of the famous tragedian, recorded on a stone the fact that he it was who provided the *first* altar for Asklepios in the Asklepieion (IG II² 4961, 4355; cf. Poseidippos in Athenae. VII 318d). Other writers could with equal propriety affirm that the first altars

were set up by Sophocles, one in his house and a second, probably in the Amyneion (Palatine Anthology, 6 145). He was, it seems, life-long priest of the orgeones, and hence we can hardly go astray if we assume that it was on his initiative that Amynos got Asklepios as *synnaos* and with him a long lease of life (below 121).

A sculptured figure of the "Receiver" was probably set up in the small chapel to confer on Sophocles immortality of remembrance (cf. Isocr. V 134, IV 84). A cult of "Sophocles" might have been a cult of the dead: a sacrifice to Dexion had, it seems to me, no such implications. No ex-votos to Dexion have come to light (cf. p. 86, n. 33, 121). None was to be expected; since, as Nock points out (CAH X, 481), "The touchstone of piety in antiquity is the votive offering, made in recognition of supposed deliverance in some invisible manner from sickness or other peril. This we do not find directed to rulers dead or living." Sophocles' metamorphosis into Dexion clearly emanated from an Asklepian environment. Dexion the Receiver, in fact, served as a link between Amynos and Asklepios.

(8) Orgeones, probably of Asklepios, but quite distinct from those of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion, appear, possibly in the third century B.C., in a catalogue of Prospaltioi, found at Keratea in the Mesogeia, who made a dedication to the god (IG II^2 2355). They were sixteen in number and, as their names show, they belonged to a small group of closely interrelated families (cf. Kirchner PA 23 and 8816). In the first family the names are Agatharchos, Agathaios, Autokles, Ameipsias, Ameinias; in the second we find Theomnemon, Theagenides, Theophantos, Theomnestos. We are inclined to believe that such was the internal complexion of the old Attic orgeones generally.[37] Possibilities to hold in mind in their case are whether they made a dedication to Asklepios and were orgeones of some other deity

[37] In size, interlocking of families, and homonymity of names the rural thiasos of a phratry whose members, twenty in number, are catalogued in IG II^2 2344 (cf. A. Koerte, Hermes, 37, 1902, 587; Ferguson, Class. Phil. 5, 1910, 257 ff. and Class. Stud. Capps, 157 n. 60; De Sanctis, Atthis^2, 59 n. 1; Premerstein, Ath. Mitt. 35, 113) is strikingly like this association of orgeones. The essential difference is that the thiasos had Zeus and Athena as its patrons; these orgeones, like all others, did not. Thiasoi of the Demotionidai might contain, on occasion, fewer than three members (IG II^2 1237, lines 76 ff.). Gennetai, on the other hand, who lacked any tie of real kinship (cf. Ferguson, Hesperia, VII, 23 f., and, in addition to the records there cited, [Demosth.] LIX 61), disclose no such interlocking of families or homonymity of names.

and whether they constitute a roster of the entire association or only of such members of it as belonged to the deme of Prospalta. Judging from the size of analogous associations (above, n. 24) we may say that sixteen was probably the full complement of its members. If it had the normal organization its Host of the moment need not have been designated by title. His name may have headed the catalogue. The definition of Pollux (above, p. 63) will therefore apply to it: its members were all grouped in one deme. The *prima facie* indications are that the god of their dedication was the god of their cult; had they been worshippers of a different god they would be expected to name him even in a dedicatory inscription. This being so, the orgeones of Prospalta can hardly have been organized for the worship of Asklepios earlier than 420/19 B.C. They were probably a rural counterpart of the urban orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion; and like this association they may have practiced the cult of a hero, in this case some rustic hero, before adopting Asklepios. In such circumstances they could hardly have escaped making dedications to the new god alone.

Asklepios made great progress in Attica in the Hellenistic age. Hence it is not surprising to find another association of Athenian citizens incorporated to do him service (IG II² 1293, 2353). They called themselves Asklepiastai. Corporate names ending in -stai ordinarily denote eranistai (Poland, 30), the notable exception being no. (15) below. This type of eranistai is post-Aristotelian, and, *mutatis mutandis*, may be thought to be analogous, shall we say, to *Les amis du Louvre*. It is derived from an ancient institution quite distinct from that of the orgeones.

(9) Another association of orgeones of heroes is known from two mortgage records (IG XII 8, 19, 314/13 B.C., and 21). The stones on which they were inscribed were found on the island of Lemnos and are to be connected with the Athenian cleruchs resident at Hephaistia. The association loaned 1000 drachmas on the security of one farm and 400 drachmas on the security of another. It was obviously not impecunious. The hero was Herakles ἐν Κόμει. Kome, now Komi, was one of the many villages on Lemnos in which the Athenian cleruchs on the *chora* of Myrina and Hephaistia lived. The arable land of the fertile island yielded in 329/28 B.C. four-fifths as much wheat and barley as Attica (IG II² 1672, ll. 263 ff. cf. Beloch, Bevölkerung, 32, Griech. Gesch.² II I 1, 300; De Sanctis, Storia dei Greci, II, 153). It was so extensive that only a fraction of the cleruchs — Beloch estimates the number of their adult males at 7000 — could reside in the two political centres. At Kome, as the extant ruins show (Fredrich, Ath. Mitt. XXXI, 251 f., PWK XII 1929 f.), there was a shrine of Herakles with a substantial temple (15 × 32 m.). With this the orgeones were associated, possibly as owners, certainly as officiants. They were doubtless well-to-do cleruchs (zeugitai) of the neighboring countryside (cf. IG XII 8, 21 n.), and the chances are that their ancestors formed the association after they settled on the island rather than transplanted it from Attica, though a nucleus of immigrant orgeones is not excluded. Whence they got the funds which they invested in mortgages on real estate we do not know; nor for that matter, do we know how any of the orgeones — excepting those of Dionysos (below, no. (15)) — came to possess their endowments.

(10) Two badly mutilated inscriptions, of which the second was cut in large letters on the side of a trapeza on top of the first, which, however, it did not obliterate completely, contain decrees of what is undoubtedly one and the same association of orgeones. The later of these inscriptions (med. s. III?), conjecturally assigned in IG II² (1246), incorrectly as now appears, to the Mesogeioi, uses the word do[gma] instead of psephisma — a usage which is paralleled in IG II² 1343 — and is natural enough. The earlier, which will be published in a study of cult tables by Sterling Dow, its discoverer, dates from the late fourth or early third century B.C. and contains the phrase *ἐν τῶι θιάσωι*. This is without a strict parallel (cf. above, p. 62, n. 2). As pointed out by Poland (17 ff.), the corporate term, thiasos, is avoided in the earlier records of private associations even by the thiasotai (cf. above, p. 68). Thiasos was then the technical name for the subdivisions of the phratries (above, pp. 62, 67). Nonetheless the embarrassment in which the orgeones found themselves of not having a corporate name of their own (above, p. 61 f.) obviously led them to substitute thiasos on occasion for the completely colorless word koinon. In the body of an orgeonic decree inscribed on an orgeonic trapeza it could mislead nobody.

Persons who officiated in some capacity and commended themselves to the orgeones were, in the unpublished decree, more than one in number, as is shown by the plural verb *ἐπεμελήθησαν*. Such they would be if the association were the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion. But the trapeza (a large stone affair) was found near the Acharnian gate, a long way from the hiera of this triad. The Piraeic associations (below, pp. 95 f.) are, of course, ruled out of consideration. Provisionally it is wise not to identify the orgeones of the trapeza with any thus far known. For that matter they may belong in Class B.

(11) A fragment of stone found in Athens on the street by "the Plaka" (near the gate of Hadrian) gives us the beginnings of six lines of an inscription from the fourth/third centuries B.C. recording some financial transaction of an association of orgeones. Professor Meritt has very kindly sent me his readings of a squeeze of the fragment by which the text in IG II² (1294) is appreciably improved:

[O]*ἱ ὀργεῶνες οἱ μετ*[*ὰ*
[. .] *Ἐπιγόνωι Ἐνδίο*[*υ*
[. *τ*]*οῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἐπα*[*κρίου*
[*διαν*]*ομῆι* [*δρα*]*χμῶ*[*ν*
[*αὐτ*]*οῖς ἅπαντα τ*[
[. . . . .]*ι τε ἀπο*[

The major part of the stone is obviously lost, hence a restoration is hopeless. It should probably proceed from a comparison with documents like IG II² 2499 and 2501 (cf. above, Nos. (2) and (3)), and Ditt. Syll.² 831 = Syll.³ 1200. The orgeones apparently sold or leased something to Epigonos the son of Endios (of Lamptrai?, cf. Kirchner, P.A. 4705, 8812 and Hesperia, IX No. 38, l. 3, p. 330), with whom the phrase [*τ*]*οῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἐπα*[*κρίου*] is probably to be connected. The place in which the stone was found makes it improb-

able that the *stele* was set up in a shrine of Zeus Epakrios.[38] Presumably the shrine of the orgeones, in which the record should have been placed, was in Athens or its immediate neighborhood. With the purpose of indicating how the first three lines *could* be connected (and with that purpose only) I complete the sentence as follows: [Ο]*ἱ ὀργεῶνες οἱ μετ*[*ὰ* name, demotic, *ἀπέδοντο τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ* name of deity] *Ἐπιγόνῳι Ἐνδίο*[*υ Λαμπτρεῖ καὶ τῶι κοινῶι τῶν συνιόντων* (or *ἀνιόντων*) *εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν* (or *τὸν βωμὸν*) *τ*]*οῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἐπα*[*κρίου ἐπι λύσει* :xxx: *δραχμῶν*].

The transaction, as imagined, left the orgeones in possession of the hieron and entitled them to recover ownership by repayment of the sum for which it was "sold," i.e., the sum which they borrowed. An interval, in which was entered the verb essential for our understanding of the connection, separates [*διαν*]*ομῆ* [*δρα*]*χμῶ*[*ν*] from what precedes. The absence of the article suggests that [*δρα*]*χμῶ*[*ν*] was followed by a numeral, and that the "distribution" affected only part of the cash received.

(12) In IG II² 2947 (third/second centuries B.C.) we encounter orgeones, but their cult is not indicated. They come to our knowledge through having recorded on stone the grant of a crown to a certain Asklapon of Maroneia. Asklapon may have been a member of the association, if, like the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods (below No. (14)), it contained aliens; but he can have been equally well an outside benefactor. The stone was found in an olive grove in the region of the ancient Academy. Its provenience suggests that it belongs to an association otherwise unknown, since no other orgeonic record has turned up in or near the Academy. This association too may belong in Class B.

There is just a trace of a second "ancient decree" in the new inscription from the Areopagus. Enough of its first line remains, however, to bring the Host (*hestiator*) into relation with the revenues. It looks as if he were the head of the association: he sacrifices, divides the flesh, and may have had charge of finance. In all probability the office was liturgical in character, like that of the officials of the same name who administered the public liturgy of providing feasts (*hestiaseis*) for their fellow tribesmen (Demosth. 20, 21; 39, 7; Arist. Pol., 1321a, 37). A. Koerte (Ath. Mitt. XXI 305) makes the orgeonic Host a borrowing from the tribal institution. The two are undoubtedly related. In each case the office of host was assumed in rotation by one after another of the members; but it seems to me that the tribal institution is the one that was borrowed, unless it be that the *hestiaseis* of the phylae

[38] Zeus "on the heights" (Epakrios) is mentioned in a fragment of the Comedian Polyzelos (Kock, CAF I, p. 791; cf. Etym. Mag. 352, 50). He had altars on Hymettos and Parnes, where there were altars of Zeus Ombrios also (Paus. I 32 2); cf. A. B. Cook, Zeus, II 873 2, n. 1, Rodney Young, AJA, 1940 1 ff. Altars of Zeus Ombrios stood in the Athenian agora in Roman times; Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII 72 f. Logically Zeus Ombrios could be worshipped anywhere but Zeus Epakrios only on "the heights." For the suggested completion of lines 2 f. cf. Paton-Hicks, Inscr. of Cos, no. 382, p. 270: *τῷ κοινῷ τῶν συμπορευομένων παρὰ Δ*[*ιὰ Ὑ*]*έτιον*, and BCH 1935, 478: *τοὺς* [*ἀναβαί*]*νοντας εἰς Ἑλικώνιον*; also Herakleides, Descriptio Graeciae, II 8 = Müller, GGM I 107.

antedated Kleisthenes, which is improbable; and, if true, they would then have remained with the old Attic phylae and not have been transferred to the new. The heads of the old Attic phylae were the phylobasileis. Hence, even if the tribal *hestiaseis* were pre-Kleisthenian, there would have been no need for special Hosts to give them. The orgeones need not have been as old as the old Attic phylae, but they were very ancient and passed from the sixth to the fifth century without violent readjustment.

The Host acts as priest and perhaps as treasurer in the association of the Hero (Echelos) and the Heroines; and in the association of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion the two Hosts seem to have performed equally comprehensive functions (p. 86). If my restoration of line 9 of IG II² 1289 is correct (above, pp. 84 f.), the Host of the orgeones of "the Goddess" was the head of that association also; but there was a priest to perform the sacrifices. Apart from (4) and (10), fragments of decrees which tell us nothing to the point, the records of the other associations of orgeones in Class A are in one case a dedication, in another a judicial record, in another a citation of crowning, and in the rest leases or mortgages. They do not call for any mention of the Host. The orgeones collectively were naturally the principals in making leases, and acted as a group without the intermediation of their officials. In one lease, as noted above, a treasurer appears as the recipient of the rent. He was an orgeon designated year by year to serve in this capacity. The association thus staffed, with a treasurer, in addition, presumably, to a Host, was probably larger and richer than the others (cf. pp. 80 f. and n. 24), excepting perhaps the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion. The importance of the Host attests the importance of the *hestiaseis* or *deipna* (Athen. V, 185 E) in the activity of the old Attic orgeones. Like the various associations (*κοινωνίαι*) spoken of by Aristotle in the Nicomachean Ethics (1160a 19) "they combined to perform sacrifices and hold festivals in connexion with them, thereby both paying honour to the gods and providing pleasant holidays for themselves" (Translation by Rackham, Loeb Classics).

Class B

The association of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion serves as a transition to the rest of the orgeones of whom we have knowledge. They have in common the worship of gods or goddesses; and the cult of imported deities. Asklepios is an importation like Bendis, the Mother of the Gods, and Aphrodite Hagne, the divinities with whom (excepting Dionysos who came to Attica so early that he was thoroughly at home there long before the third century B.C.) the remainder of the orgeonic records now to be discussed is concerned. These were all living deities. Hence the adoption of the orgeonic type of organization by their votaries shows of itself that the institution did not belong distinctively to the cultus of the dead.

It is hardly an accident that all these further records come from the Piraeus. It was there that these orgeones had their sacred precincts. The Piraeus was a deme of which the membership was limited to the descendants of those enrolled in it at the time of Kleisthenes. The Piraeus was also, however, substantially a new town and it was inhabited by a large population of non-demotai — men who with their families had migrated without changing their deme affiliations from other parts of Attica —, and of aliens, Greeks and non-Greeks, from many parts of the Mediterranean world, whom the business of the Piraeus drew to it. The deme came to be a small politically organized enclave set in the midst of a population of unorganized aliens or of citizens whose political, gentile, orgeonic, or phratry affiliations were with groups centered in other parts of Attica.[39] The situation was thus uniquely favorable for the organization of new local religious ties and associations. In fact the Piraeic deme was compelled to take official action in the middle of the fourth century B.C. to control the use of one of its most important precincts (the Thesmophorion) by unauthorized groups (thiasoi) or persons (IG II² 1177).

The orgeonic records in question concern Bendis, the Mother of the Gods, Dionysos, and Hagne Aphrodite (the Syrian Goddess), and they will be taken up in that order, which is also, it seems, the order of their creation.

(13) So far as our records go the orgeones of Bendis present us with a *novelty* and something quite unique, an association of this type constituted wholly of aliens. Our first reference to this association is found in the opening lines of Plato's Republic: "I went down yesterday to the Peiraeus," says Socrates, " —— to pay my devotions to the Goddess, and also because I wished to see how they would conduct the festival since this was its inauguration. I thought the procession of the citizens very fine, but it was no better than the show made by the marching of the Thracian contingent." [40] What Socrates had seen was

[39] The demarch of the Piraeus, unlike the demarchs of the other demes of Attica, was a public official selected by lot from the citizens generally (Arist. Ath. Pol. 54, 8). His authority was correspondingly wide.

[40] Trans. by Shorey, Loeb Classics.

the arrival in the Piraeus from Athens of the *pompe* of the natives and the *pompe* of the Thracians, both in honor of the Thracian goddess Bendis. After he had started to walk back to Athens he learned that the proceedings were not yet finished. There remained a torch-light race in the evening in which horsemen — a Thracian innovation (Nilsson, Griech. Feste, 252; Kazarow, PWK 2te Reihe, XI 505 ff.), and an expensive one — carried lighted torches and passed them along to one another as they raced (for a condensed illustration see P. Hartwig, Bendis, pl. II); and, in addition, a night festival (*pannychis*). So he turned back.

From another even more authentic source (IG II² 1283) we learn that the Superintendents (epimeletai) of the Thracian orgeones met the procession on its arrival in the Piraeus and furnished its members in the Nymphaion with sponges, basins, and water with which to refresh themselves, gave them crowns which were *de rigueur* for banquets, and had lunch ready for them in the shrine of the Goddess. Presumably the epimeletai of the citizen orgeones did the like for the participants in the procession of Athenians.

The fête — the Bendideia, celebrated annually on the nineteenth/twentieth of Thargelion [41] — was accordingly inaugurated at the dramatic date of the Republic, which is thought to be ca. 411/10 B.C.,[42] after the return of Polemarchos to Athens in 412/11 B.C. Bendis was recognized by Athens some twenty years or so before 411/10. In the year 429/28 B.C. she appears among the Other Gods whose holdings of gold and silver were assembled on the Acropolis by the decrees of Kallias enacted in 434 B.C. (IG I² 310, l. 207 (Βε[ν]δῖδος]); cf. IG I² 91/2); and the presumption is that she already had a hieron from which her treasures were withdrawn. Giving effect to an oracle from Dodona the state conceded to the Thracians, what it had not conceded theretofore to alien groups (*μόνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν*), the right to found and own a sanctuary of their national

[41] Scholion on Plato, Republic, 327a.

[42] Shorey, Loeb Classics, Introduction, viii. Cf., however, P.W. s.v. Bendideia. Deubner, Att. Feste, 220, fixes no date. The Bendideion was certainly there in 404/03 B.C. (Xen. Hell. II, 4, 11).

goddess on Attic soil (IG II² 1283, 261/60? B.C.). This was probably done in the time of Pericles, the most likely moment being 431 B.C. on the conclusion of the treaty of alliance between Athens and Sitalkes, the powerful king of the Odrysians (Thucy. II 29, 96; Aristoph. Achar. 141 ff., cf. Ed. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt. IV 74, 312, 321, 339, Leuk in PWK 2te Reihe, XI 421 ff.). Her acquisition of a shrine must have antedated the organization of the Bendideia. With her was associated in the Piraeic cult the Thracian hero Deloptes (IG II² 1324), and on his account both associations of orgeones had priests as well as priestesses. It may be inferred from the constitution of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods, which was modelled on that of the orgeones of Bendis (below, 109), that the priestess of citizens and Thracians alike was allotted annually from the womenfolk of the orgeones. The priest was undoubtedly an orgeon similarly designated.

We know that the procession of the Thracians was conducted by the Thracian orgeones (IG II² 1283, ca. 260 B.C.), and the evidence is that the procession of the citizens was conducted by the orgeones of citizens (cf. IG II² 1324). Official records of both associations have come into our possession; arranged in chronological order, with those of the Thracians marked by an asterisk, they are: IG II² 1255 (337/36 B.C.), 1256 (329/28 B.C.), 1361 (second half of the fourth century B.C.), 1324 (late fourth or early third century B.C., Dow, HTR, 1937, 197 n. 54), *1283 (261/60? B.C.), *1284 (259/58? B.C.). According to an observation of Wilhelm (Oester. Jahresh.) V 1902, 132; cf. Kirchner IG II² 1361, n., Ferguson, Athen. Trib. Cycles, 81, n. 1), those which are dated on the second day of the month or crown *bene meritos* with a crown of olives (IG II² 1324) belong to the citizen orgeones, as does the orgeonic law of the latter half of the fourth century B.C. in which the second of each month is fixed as the day of meetings (IG II² 1361, ll. 16 ff.). Those records which are dated on the 8th day of the month (IG II² 1283, 8th of Hekatombaion, 1284, 8th of Skirophorion), or which use oak leaves in their crown (IG II² 1284) belong to the Thracian orgeones.[43] Each association had superintendents,

[43] Two records lack these criteria for assignment to one specific association,

who had general oversight of the association's affairs, a priestess and a priest, a treasurer and a secretary (IG II² 1255, 1324). In addition the citizens had Makers of Sacrifices (hieropoioi, cf. IG II² 1361, l. 16), who had the duty, over and above what the name implies, of collaborating with the superintendents in convoking the meetings of the orgeones. In organization both differ markedly from the orgeones of heroes whom we have been considering heretofore. They are much more completely staffed. The Host (*hestiator*) is lacking. Obviously we have larger associations, with more complex affairs.

The association of citizens consisted originally of members and their male descendants (IG II² 1361 l. 2).[44] Succession was therefore hereditary. But in a law passed in the latter half of the fourth century B.C. provision was made for an increase in the membership and the association was opened to anyone who was willing (ὁ *βουλόμενος*) to pay the stipulated fee. As

IG II² 1255 (337/36 B.C.) and 1256 (329/28 B.C.). If 1255 really concerns Bendis, as is probable, I should assign it to the citizens. The space in l. 2 is too long by one letter to permit us to restore Ὀλύμπου from IG II² 1284. On the other hand, there is a possible connection between IG II² 1255 and 1324. Thallos, secretary in 337/36 B.C., may be the father of Stephanos, epimeletes in the later document, if both are descendants of Stephanos son of Thallos of Lys. XIX 46; cf. Kirchner, P. A. 12883. IG II² 1255 honors three Athenian hieropoioi, *οἱ ἐπὶ Φρυνίχου ἄρχοντος* with a gold crown, because they had "well and loyally cared for the procession, the distribution of flesh, and all other affairs." If these were the hieropoioi of the association, the association certainly consisted of citizens; if, as is more probable, they were three of the ten public hieropoioi (Arist. Ath. Pol. 54, 6), citizens would be more likely to command their services than Thracians. The receipt of a gold crown rather than the one of olive or oak normally conferred on the orgeonic officials suggests that the hieropoioi were public magistrates. IG II² 1496 does not make clear from which hieropoioi the *dermatika* (in 334/33 B.C. to the amount of 457 drachmas) came to the state annually after the time of Lycurgus, but it is commonly assumed, correctly, as I believe, that they were the public officials. All the *dermatika* obviously came from victims sacrificed by the state. The officials who handed over the *dermatika* were, I think, those who procured the animals: they may or may not have performed the sacrifices (cf., however, U. Kahrstedt, Untersuch. z. Magistratur in Athen, 289 f.).

[44] Since orgeones regularly kept rolls of their members (Isaeus, II 14; IG II² 2355, 1325), which they on occasion transcribed on stone tablets, the problem raised by line 2 of this text and discussed by Ziehen (II 1, 41, n.) concerns only the occasion which called for the *stele* in question. The names of the *ἔκγονοι* were not recorded on the *stele*, on which, however, new names were to be added as the new recruits contemplated were approved for admission to the association by the orgeones (lines 20 ff.).

is not uncommon, even when this phrase occurs in laws, the words οἷς ἔξεστιν are understood with it (Demosth. XXIV 105, XLIII 54, XXIII 28; Arist. Ath. Pol. 56. 6, 48. 4, 9. 1). In a case in which non-citizens were comprehended Demosthenes (XXI 45) used ἅπαντι τῷ βουλομένῳ. We are not justified in assuming that the association was opened to non-citizens. The purpose of the innovation was to insure that "the orgeones were as numerous as possible." Thereafter admission to the citizen association was not wholly hereditary. A further provision of the law empowered the orgeones to impose a fine of 50 drachmas on any member who presented, or put to vote, a motion nullifying the new ordinances, and to exclude him from the society. A member could accordingly be dropped for cause. The orgeones of the Mother of the Gods (No. 14) had a similar capacity (IG II² 1328 l. 15).

The spectacular effect of the *pompe* depended upon the number participating in it. Its size was accordingly a matter of concern to both associations of orgeones responsible for it. So far as we know all the participants were orgeones.[45] Their obligation to make the procession was imposed by public law. This is explicitly affirmed in a decree of the Thracian association (IG II² 1283, ca. 261/60 B.C.). It is there stated that a public law "ordered" the Thracians to make the procession in honor of Bendis from the prytaneion in Athens to the Piraeus.

[45] Since the Bendideia was a public fête the civic hieropoioi were concerned generally with its management; hence they had a care for the *pompe* (IG II² 1255). This, however, does not imply that non-orgeones marched in the procession. Three decrees of thiasotai of Bendis have been found on the island of Salamis at the same spot (IG II² 1317, 1317b, and SEG II 10). The formal meetings of this association were held, like those of the citizen orgeones in the Piraeus, on the second day of the month. This suggests that there was some connection between the islanders and the Athenian (rather than the Thracian) association in the harbor-town; in fact all three decrees from Salamis were passed on the first second day of the month after the Bendideia, i.e., Skirophorion. These decrees are all votes of honor to the officials of the thiasotai. It is conceivable that they had celebrated the Bendideia on the island at the regular time, the 19/20th of the preceding month; but it is also conceivable that they had taken part in the great celebration in the Piraeus. The association on Salamis differs not only in its name from those in the Piraeus but also in its organization, in that it was served by a priest, not by a priestess and priest. Its members were obviously non-citizens, and doubtless non-Thracians.

The orgeones apparently acted for the entire Thracian ethnos (for the ethne as recognized groups in Athens see IG II² 956, ll. 13, 53 f.), and the suggestion is strong that, while at any given moment the orgeones were a definite group of enrolled Thracians, all Thracians living in the Piraeus who cared to enter the association and to assume its obligations might do so (1283 ll. 29 ff.). At a later time the Thracians in the *asty* created a separate association of orgeones and took steps to set up a hieron of their own (ca. 261/60 B.C.). Negotiations ensued between the two associations regarding the *pompe*. Arrangements were concluded for the two groups to march together and for the old association not only to make available to their city confrères on their arrival in the Piraeus all the services they furnished their own members, but also to include them solemnly in the prayers offered with the sacrifices; "so that, this being done (the text runs) and the whole ethnos being in harmony, the sacrifices may be offered to the gods and all else pertaining thereto done, according to the customs (*patria*) of the Thracians and the laws (*nomoi*) of Athens." Urban orgeones were permitted to join the Piraeic association, without, it appears, paying dues.

During the afternoon victims were sacrificed and the orgeones banqueted from the flesh. Since the state, in and after 334 B.C., claimed the skins, animals for the Bendideia were furnished by the polis both then and earlier. To meet the costs of the sacrifices offered by the association of citizens at the time of the Bendideia a fee of two drachmas was levied annually on each member (IG II² 1361); and the Thracians were doubtless subject to a similar assessment. With payments of two drachmas per person it would take the contributions of some 35 persons to buy an ox (Stengel, Kultusalt.³, 115). From the sale of the skins of the victims sacrificed at the Bendideia the state realized 457 drachmas in 334/33 B.C. (IG II² 1496). At the rate of 3 drachmas per skin (Boeckh, Staatsh.³ 97) or 4½ (id. II 22*) 150 or 100 victims would have been required to yield this amount. The sacrifice was probably a hecatomb. Obviously the flesh of the animals furnished by the state was distributed among the magistrates and people (cf. IG II² 334); and it may

have been carried home raw. Manifestly the Bendideia was a public fête. The orgeones may have banqueted privately, each association, or perhaps the Thracian alone, in its own hieron. Even though it had its own sacrificial animals and its own hieropoioi, the citizen group undoubtedly shared in the flesh of the victims furnished by the state. Such was certainly the case if the hieropoioi of IG II^2 1255 were the public officials of that name. The chances are that the native orgeones took their portions of the public victims home with them.

A pannychis, or night festival, was part of the Bendideia. Regarding this all we know is what is said in Plato's Republic (328a). Polemarchos suggests to Socrates, "and besides, there is to be a night festival which will be worth seeing. For after dinner we will get up and go out and see the sights and meet a lot of the lads there and have good talk." [46] What "the sights" were which a "lot of the lads" and others were "to see" by twilight or the light of the full moon [47] we do not know. Like Artemis, Bendis was a goddess of the wild-lands and the chase, and her cult images in Attica represented her as a strapping long-legged girl, clad in Thracian clothes with a kilted tunic, a jerkin made of the hide of an animal (panther, wolf?) with the tail, or its like, pendant in front, a peaked cap with an apron back, a cloak falling behind from her shoulders to her heels, and soft leather boots turned over above the calf. She is accompanied by a hound, and holds her spear in her left hand while extending a patera, for the receipt of gifts or the bestowal of blessings, with her right (Cumont, Rev. Arch. II 1903, 381 ff., Pl. XVI; Foucart, Le culte de Bendis en Attique, Mélanges Perrot, 95 ff.). Presumably the "sights" had a Thracian character. Deloptes is less tangible (cf. Kern, Rel. d. Hell. II 239, n. 1; Kazarow in PWK 2te Reihe, XII 475). Plastically represented he is a bearded man leaning on a staff (P. Hartwig, Bendis, Taf. 1; Th. Wiegand, Ath. Mitt. XXV 172). His resemblance to Asklepios may or may not be significant. In the Samian inscription (Wiegand, l.c.) he has the title Hero.

It is clear that the hieron which the Thracian orgeones

[46] Shorey's translation in Loeb Classics.

[47] Nineteenth of the lunar month.

founded and owned in the Piraeus was not the hieron in which the citizen orgeones met and sacrificed. The chances are that the latter was not established till the Bendideia was organized by the state in 411/10 B.C. or thereabouts; and, indeed, it is doubtful whether either association of orgeones antedated this event. The procession, from the civic hearth in Athens (ἀπὸ τῆς ἑστίας τῆς ἐκκ τοῦ πρυτανείου) to the Piraeus, with which the orgeones were primarily concerned, is, to be sure, affirmed by the Thracians in ca. 261/60 B.C. to have been covered by the original oracle from Dodona (IG II² 1283 ll. 3 ff., but cf. ll. 10 ff.); but since it was clearly a novelty of the first celebration of the Bendideia its inauguration must have been deferred for some time after the Thracians founded their hieron in the Piraeus. Starting where it did the procession was an official linking of the Bendideion with the centre of Athenian civic and religious authority. The citizen orgeones contemplated that non-members would sacrifice in their shrine, but they required that specified portions of the sacrificial animals should be given to their priestess and priest, the priestess getting hers from the female and the priest his from the male victims; and they imposed severe penalties for illicit sacrificing in their shrine. In their hieron there was a house which they let for profit and also a spring or a well the water from which they sold. The keeping of the house and the hieron in repair required expenses which the orgeones had themselves to defray. In general they disposed of the shrine as they saw fit (cf. IG II² 1324 ll. 25 ff.). As we have seen, the Athenian state had granted to the Thracians the right, denied to aliens, of acquiring real property and the privilege of consecrating it to Bendis. As owners they undoubtedly had charge of the upkeep of their shrine, but their records are of such a nature that they give us no information on the point. The two shrines may have been adjacent and together constituted the Bendideion which lay on the broad road leading from the agora of Hippodamos to the temple of Artemis Munychia (Xen. Hell. II 4 11; cf. Threpsiades, Praktika, 1935, 195).

Upon these associations of orgeones the state put certain demands: as we have seen, it compelled the Thracians to make

the procession; and the obligation of the natives to do likewise was one which, as citizens, they could not escape even if they had wanted to. The torch-race and the pannychis were probably subject to the same constraint or obligation. The Bendideia was a national fête and the relation of the orgeones to it was like that of the genos of the Salaminioi to the Oschophoria (Hesperia, VII, 1938, 33 ff.).

The orgeones of Bendis and Deloptes, both the citizen and the Thracian association, belong to the class of those worshipping gods or goddesses. The action of the citizen group in calling themselves orgeones did not constitute much more of an innovation than the assumption of Asklepios by the orgeones of Amynos; but the use of the name orgeones by the Thracians was quite extraordinary and is, in my opinion, grounded in the performance by them, by order of the state, of a public function (cf. above, n. 8). If their offices had been purely private they would probably have been called thiasotai; such at any rate was the nomenclature of associations of aliens in the fourth and later centuries. The state may have thought it expedient not to draw distinctions of nomenclature between the citizens and Thracians who assumed jointly responsibility for the spectacular part of the Bendideia. During the epoch in which the Bendideia was inaugurated the Thracians were of importance both for Athens and Athenian policy. They were employed as mercenaries (Thucy. VII 29 f.; cf. Ed. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt. IV 363) and they served as operatives in the mines (Xen. Ways and Means, IV 14; Cumont, Rev. Arch. II 1903, 381 ff.). After the Athenian disaster in Sicily, when the Lacedaemonians and the Athenians became competitors for the materials for oars and triremes, and the waters connecting the Aegean and the Black Sea became the chief area of naval operations, it must have seemed opportune to the Athenians to treat the Thracians resident in their land with peculiar consideration.

We must now ask ourselves, who were the men from whom the citizen orgeones were formed? Two answers are possible: (*a*) Athenians who were already orgeones — men who might add membership in the association of Bendis and Deloptes to that which they already possessed and (*b*) Athenians (non-

gennetai) who lacked membership in any association of orgeones. Neither of these possibilities can be excluded. The case of Simon of Poros discussed below (p. 117) shows that at least in the later third century an Athenian who belonged to one society of orgeones became a charter member of another newly formed. Dual membership was accordingly permissive. On the other hand, the legislation providing for the enlargement of the citizen orgeones of Bendis in the late fourth century (IG II² 1361) would doubtless have been formulated differently if the new recruits had had to be drawn from existing groups of orgeones. There accordingly existed at this time and earlier a reservoir of potential orgeones.

A full explanation of the source of this reservoir would require an examination of the entire internal history of Athens; and this is not the place for that. All that is possible here is to enunciate dogmatically a series of pertinent propositions. (1) At Solon's time — the date of the second law quoted above (p. 68 f.) — the citizens automatically registered in the rolls of the phratries were either gennetai or orgeones, the former representing Solon's pentakosiomedimnoi and hippeis, the latter his zeugitai. The keeping of written catalogues by the phratries was a comparatively recent innovation (cf. Rodney Young, AJA, 1940, 8). The general assumption underlying Draco's laws on homicide was that all Athenians were phrateres, but until systematic registration was completed many citizens of, shall we say, the under-privileged class, whose citizenship was passive until Solon's reforms, were presumably without demonstrable phratry connections, and, so far as they got any phratry protection at all, they got it through the championship of their claims by interested nobles. Solon's law settled the problem for citizens who belonged to the associations of gennetai and orgeones, but apparently left it to the phratries to use their discretion in registering the others, who had to be dealt with individually. In this particular, as in his political program generally, Solon compromised. But by shifting the basis of citizen privileges and rights from birth to property, he enabled individual orgeones to become *potential* gennetai and individual thetes to become *potential* orgeones. At some time or other

the list of the genê — the "so-called genê" of the lexicographers — became closed. One of the latest genê to be created was that of the Salaminioi. Its origin seems to belong to the century covered by the lives of Solon and Pisistratus (Hesperia VII 1938, 42 ff.). Obviously the list of the orgeones remained open: new associations of this type were being created as late as 420/19 B.C. (cf. No. (8)) and later. The various associations of Solon's first law (above p. 64) were, of course, not mutually exclusive: "men going forth for plunder" (pirates, raiders), for example, must have been phrateres and, on occasion, gennetai, and gennetai were certainly phrateres. (2) Kleisthenes extended active citizen rights downwards and made them dependent upon membership in the demes and phylae, the latter being fictitious kin-groups connected each with a divinely designated Ahnherr of Attic provenience. All Athenian citizens thus became in established theory *potential* phrateres, and it seems unquestionable that all phyletai who applied were admitted thereafter to phratries. The identification of IG II² 2344 as the roll of a single thiasos, not of an entire phratry, disposes of Koerte's idea (cf. above, n. 37 and below, n. 48) that in the fourth century B.C. only a small fraction of the Athenians were phrateres. (3) It may have been in 507/06 B.C. that the phratries, adjusting their organization to the new members, created their own subdivisions — the thiasoi —, thus carrying out systematically the fusion of new "citizens" and old which was one of the primary objects of the Kleisthenian system (Draco's and Solon's phratries had been aristocratically controlled, IG I² 115 ll. 18 f.). Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 21, 6) has been taken to prove that the list of the phratries was closed before 507/06 B.C., but the point is arguable, and it may be that it was not till Kleisthenes had completed his reforms that the creation of new phratries ceased.[48] In any case, as we have

[48] In Ath. Pol. all that Aristotle says is that no phrateres were dispossessed of membership in their respective phratries. In his Politics (1319b 20) he clearly implies that Kleisthenes increased the number both of phylae and phratries. The two statements are not contradictory. What seems contradictory is Kleisthenes' policy of manning new phratries with new citizens and his policy of fusing new elements and old in a common brotherhood. This contradiction becomes less flat if we assume, as we may, that many old citizens (thetes?) lacked registration

seen, the list of orgeones remained open after 507/06 B.C. Thereafter phrateres who were not members of orgeonic associations might continue to found new associations of this type. Naturally the largest accumulation of such potential orgeones was to be found in the Piraeus, but not exclusively there (cf. No. (8) above). In the view of Athenian internal development thus outlined the creation of citizen orgeones of Bendis and Deloptes near the end of the fifth century presents no difficulties.

(14) A second non-heroic cult with an association of worshippers distinguished by the name orgeones is that of the Mother of the Gods. The decrees of this association,[49] ar-

in phratries in 507/06 B.C., so that the new phratries contained them as well as the νεοπολῖται. The division of the phratries, old and new, into thiasoi, themselves kin groups (cf. n. 37), would have brought it about that in many cases thiasoi of the old brotherhoods and the new were hardly distinguishable socially. Without dismembering or adulterating the existent phratries Kleisthenes could go no farther along this line in carrying out his policy of civic fusion. De Sanctis (Atthis[2], 58 ff.) is right in rejecting the view that the number of the phratries was ever fixed at twelve. His comment on my argument (Class. Phil. 1910, 271) is quite justified. The Aristotelian scheme which includes twelve phratries (Ath. Pol. frg. 3) purports to give the constitution of Ion, not the constitution of contemporary times. The number twelve is probably due to an unwarranted identification of phratries and old Attic trittyes, which were in fact twelve in number (Class. Stud. Capps, 151 ff.). We now know the names of eight phratries, the seven listed in the article just cited (154) and the Medontidai (above, No. (5). For the Etionidai see below, Appendix 2). There were doubtless many others. For the ruins of what was probably a phratrion, with a well-preserved inscribed altar of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria, see Kyparisses and Thompson, Hesperia, VII 615 ff.

[49] Though the stone was found in the hieron from which the records of the orgeones have come (Foucart, Assoc. relig. 199), IG II[2] 1273 (284/83? B.C.) does not belong to them. It is a decree (two decrees rather) of thiasotai, not orgeones, and they were served, not by a priestess, but by a priest. The priest, moreover, held office for a half-year only, the calendar year being divided into two halves, one beginning with or in Boedromion, the month of the autumnal equinox, and other with or in Elaphebolion, the month of the vernal equinox. A semestral term of office is not without precedent: it existed for example in Delphi for the bouleutai and in Thessaly for tamiai (IG IX 2, Index, 315) and was apparently quite common throughout Greece (Arist. Pol. 1299a, 1308a). A term of office shorter than a year was doubtless more practical for an association of aliens whose business, when it was foreign trade, did not permit them to be in the Piraeus throughout the year. Even in the case of the orgeones the annual term of their treasurer entailed makeshifts (IG II[2] 1329, cf. below, p. 114). The plenary assembly of the

ranged in chronological order, are: IG II² 1316 (246/45? B.C.), 1301 (220/19 B.C.), 1314 (213/12 B.C.), 1315 (211/10 B.C.), 1328 I (183/82 B.C.), 1327 (178/77 B.C.), 1328 II and 1329 (175/74 B.C.), 1334 (ca. 70 B.C.).[50] It is to be observed that the sanctuary of this association was a private Metroon located on the peninsula of Akte in the Piraeus, not the civic Metroon situated, along with the Bouleuterion and the Tholos, on the west side of the Agora in Athens. The Mother Goddess of the temple in the city was originally an Athenian parallel, without the Mysteries, to the Demeter of the Thesmophoria and Eleusis:[51] the Mother of the Gods of the Metroon in the Piraeus was the Great Mother of Pessinus in Phrygia, privately imported and worshipped in the Piraeic Metroon first by an association of aliens (thiasotai, IG II² 1273) and then, at some point between 284/83 and 246/45? B.C.,[52] by orgeones, who

thiasotai, for passing decrees and choosing officers, was held in Anthesterion, two months earlier than that of the orgeones (cf. Pritchett and Meritt, The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, 91 ff.). "Les cérémonies de rite phrygien duraient du 15 au 27 mars" (Graillot, Le culte de Cybèle, 116). The vernal equinox (March 21) fell in their midst. The beginning of the semester of the thiasotai thus preceded the time of the chief fête of the Mother of the Gods while the *ἀγορὰ κυρία* of the orgeones followed it. Its officials were aliens, not citizens. In 284/83 B.C. it was this association which owned the hieron of the Mother of the Gods in Akte (IG II² 1273, ll. 7, 24, 31).

[50] See Appendix 4.

[51] H. Thompson in Hesperia, VI, 1937, 205 ff., cf. William A. McDonald, The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks, 159 ff. Her cult statue, made apparently by Agorakritos, shows, however, that at a relatively early date she was so represented plastically as to be in fact an Atticized Kybele. Cf. A. von Salis, Jahrbuch, XXVIII, 1913, 1 ff., 23. This image, which was famous in Roman times (Paus. I 3, 5; Pliny, Nat. Hist. XXXVI, 17; Arrian, Peripl. 9) had much influence on the subsequent iconography of the Mother of the Gods. There is, I believe, no trace of Attis in the civic cult. Could the presence of two images of the Mother in each of a considerable number of Attic naiskoi be a recognition (made at some one time perhaps and expressed in a doubled cult-image in a particular shrine) that the goddess was two in one? Cf. below, p. 138.

[52] The thiasotai were building their *oikos* in 284 B.C.; cf. IG II² 1273. The earliest datable dedication in the hieron was made by Manes and Mika, apparently aliens, about the end of the fourth century B.C.: (IG II² 4609; cf. Conze, Arch. Zeitung, 38, 1 Taf. 2). This does not need to date the founding of the hieron earlier than 306 B.C. (cf. above, p. 67). For the transfer of the shrine to the orgeones see Appendix 4. The hieron was excavated in 1855 by le corps d'occupation français du Pirée. Louis Robert (BCH 1936, 206 f.) refers for the history of the dig to E. Michon, Buste de Mélitiné, prêtresse du Metrôon du Pirée (Musée

were, of course, citizens. The general organization of the orgeones was identical with that of the orgeones of Bendis from which it was obviously copied, either directly or indirectly: epimeletai, treasurer, secretary, priestess (but no priest and no hieropoioi). The priestess was elected by lot annually from the womenfolk of the association,[53] and could serve more than

du Louvre), Mémoires de la Soc. Nat. des Antiquaires de France, 75 (1918), 5, Série 8, pp. 91–129, and, for a catalogue of the dedications taken from the shrine, to H. Graillot, Le culte de Cybèle, 507, n. (cf. Foucart, Assoc. relig. 199 ff.). Arranged in their chronological order, the inscriptions attached to these dedications are as follows: IG II² 4609, already commented on; 4687a, dated by the name of Glaukon, priestess of the orgeones in 214/13 B.C. (IG II² 1314), taken from a votive offering to Men; 2950/1, inscribed on a lustral basin given by Nikias, tamias (of the orgeones), and dated in the second century B.C.; 4696, from a dedication to Artemis Nana, and 4703, from a round marble altar, dated before the middle of the first century B.C.; 4714, dated in the archonship of Epikrates early in the principate of Augustus, from a dedication to "the Mother of the Gods accessible, healing, Aphrodite"; 4038, dated in the age of Augustus; 4760, dated in the first/second centuries A.D.; 4759, dated in the second century A.D.; 2887, dated by the name of the archon Philistides in 163/64 A.D. (Oliver, Hesperia, XI 86), from a dedication made by Melitine, an ex-priestess (of the orgeones) in the priesthood of Philemon, son of Praxiteles of Phlya, a well-known man; and 4814, dated in the second/third centuries A.D., from a dedication made by a paidagogos to Hermes Hegemon. There is also a lot of uninscribed votive offerings in Graillot's catalogue, notably terra cotta statuettes of the goddess, seated, with a lion on her lap or crouched at her side, and holding a patera in her right hand and a tympanon or a sceptre in her left. From IG II² 2887 we may infer that in 163/64 A.D. a public priest was associated with the priestess of the orgeones in the cult of the Mother of the Gods in the Piraeus. In other words, by that time the state had taken over the Metroon (cf. above, n. 36). There is a good chance that this step is connected with the transformance of the cult of the Mother of the Gods throughout the Roman Empire with which it can have synchronized, cf. Wissowa, Rel. u. Kultus d. Römer², 322 ff.

The bringing of Artemis Nana (cf. Foucart, Assoc. relig. 101) and Aphrodite into association with the Mother of the Gods calls for no comment. For dedications to Men and Hermes it will suffice to quote the following inscription from Rome (CIL VI 499 = Dessau, Inscr. lat. sel. 4147, 374 A.D.; cf. Robert, Mélanges Bidez, 802 f.): "Matri Deum Magnae Idaee summae parenti Hermae et Attidi Menotyranno invicto."

[53] For the selecting of priestesses by lot from the womenfolk of an association see the record of the Salaminioi published in Hesperia, VII 1938, pp. 2 ff., ll. 12 ff.; cf. pp. 50 ff. Neither in this instance nor in the one with which we are now concerned is it implied that the womenfolk were members of the association except insofar as they were such through being wives, sisters, daughters, etc. of members; cf. above, p. 75 ff. In IG II² 1328 II we have the phrase ταῖς τε ἱερείαις καὶ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν. In a Coan document regulating the appointment of a priestess of Demeter (Ziehen, Leges sacrae, II 1, 132) it was provided that women absent at

once if the lot so decided. The treasurer and the secretary were appointed without limit of time or regularly reappointed year after year, while the epimeletai changed, it seems, each year. In their business they thus followed the pattern of Athens. Their religious practices, however, were taken over from the homeland of the Mother of the Gods, with the omission, however, of some of the more repulsive features, notably the services of galloi (Cumont, PW VII, 676) and metragyrtai. We should look for no analogies to them in the practices of the old Attic orgeones. These yielded them their name with the implied reservation of membership to the descendants of members.

The second implication of the name — the exclusion of aliens (cf. M. N. Tod, Sidelights on Greek History, 74) — does not hold. The orgeones took over the hieron from its founders, who were thiasotai and aliens (its two officials in 284/83 came, one from Troezen and the other from Herakleia); and part of the transaction was apparently the incorporation of at least some of these with themselves. By their inclusion, we may assume, the orgeones escaped the necessity of raising a considerable sum of money for land and buildings. The Athenians were naturally the predominant element, and accordingly they arranged it so that their wives were the priestesses, they themselves controlled the civil offices, and it was they exclusively who made the motions at the business meetings. The inclusion of aliens was a deviation from ancient practice. The orgeones of Bendis did not furnish a complete analogy since there the Thracians and the citizens formed separate associations; but nonetheless, and however sanctioned, Thracians had been orgeones long before 284/83 B.C. As we have seen (above, p. 68), Athenians kept pretty well away from the associations of thiasotai during the third century B.C.: participation in them meant for citizens a social let-down. The aliens among the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods were probably zealous workers in a small way because they had a sense of privilege. Foucart (Assoc. relig. 139 ff.) demolished effectively exag-

the time of allotment could be represented by their κύριοι. Normally the women themselves would have to draw the lots.

gerated notions as to the rôle of social uplift and humanitarianism in the activities of Greek private associations; but the example of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods in putting an Ergasion on their board of epimeletai in 178/77 B.C. (IG II^2 1327), and perhaps one alien each year, indicates a certain weakening, attributable to the intermingling of citizens and aliens in a religious fraternity, of deep-rooted prejudices. The influence of the great Athenian schools of philosophy (thiasoi in fact if not in name), which ignored considerations of nationality and, in the Garden, of sex, was, however, more powerful as a social solvent and at a higher level.

The transfer of the Metroon in the Piraeus from thiasotai to orgeones undoubtedly strengthened the association both socially and administratively. It also put this cult of the Mother of the Gods in the hands of people who were likely to be more sensitive to Athenian public opinion, which had long reacted strongly against many of its features (Foucart, Assoc. relig. 153 ff.). Certainly there is no evidence for these features in the records of the orgeones. The substitution of a priestess for a priest must mean something. It probably registers a defeat for Attis.

The ladies of the old Attic orgeones participated in the annual sacrifices-feasts; but the *stroseis* and the *agermoi* with which the women of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods were particularly, if not exclusively, concerned were foreign to them. The ex-priestesses of the Mother of the Gods formed a permanent group which was capable of formulating a collective request for presentation to the association by one of the orgeones. In other words it might on occasion be a sort of probouleutic body regarding matters which concerned it directly.[54] Part of the staff of the association was a corps of woman "cupbearers" (*phialephoroi*) and "ladies in waiting on the Goddess" who, adorned with a silver *kosmos* furnished by the priestess, formed the cortège of the Goddess and her consort in the processions, presumably through the streets, at which

[54] On the known occasion they intervened to support a policy of the secretary of setting limits to the expenses to which the orgeones in general and they in particular were exposed (IG II^2 1328 I and 1329).

collections were taken (cf. Ziehen, Leges sacrae, II 1, 44, p. 126, notes: Ditt. Syll.^{2} 601, 25 = Syll.^{3} 1015). As Ziehen points out, citing Ovid (ex. Pont. I 1, 39), these solemn processions gave the public an opportunity to offer their mite to the Mother of the Gods. The processionals were anything but vagrant metragyrtai (Hell. Ath. 225 is wrong). The priestess, alone or with the help of her husband, officiated at the sacrifices of the orgeones (IG II^2 1316), opened the hieron on the specified days and stayed there till she closed it, and recorded the dedications made and the moneys received (fees paid by outside sacrificers, perhaps, cf. E. Ziebarth, Das griech. Vereinswesen, 161) in the course of her year of service (IG II^2 1316). She also served as leader of the women connected with the society. Perhaps not at first, certainly later, she appointed a zakoros to assist her. During some period prior to 183/82 B.C. a certain Euaxis performed model service in this capacity. For seven years (183/82–176/75 B.C.) the priestess was limited in her choice to ex-priestesses and was forbidden to reappoint anyone till all the ex-priestesses had had their turn. Then this limitation was removed and the zakoros in office was given by the orgeones a lifelong term. As befitted an association formed for the worship of the Mother of the Gods, the womenfolk of the orgeones were unusually prominent in the cult-offices.

The Mother of the Gods was worshipped by the orgeones in the same spirit as *Magna Mater* was worshipped in Republican Rome outside the Palatine. There is no analogy in Athens to the purely Phrygian cult established on the Palatine. What Rome imported and isolated on the Palatine was not the Great Mother alone but a complete Phrygian staff dedicated to her service (Dion. Hal. Rom. Antiq. II 19, 4: cf. Wissowa, Religion u. Kultus der Römer, 319 f.). In the Piraeus the staff of Phrygians was absent. The rites performed at the Attideia were such as an Athenian priestess could perform with propriety; and if, as seems likely (Appendix 4), there was one Attideia for aliens and another for citizens, the rites for both must have been in greater or less degree Hellenized. There is evidence for a couch with two seats (*θρόνοι*) in the procession. There is evidence for the beating of kettledrums — the

tympanon is present in the symbolism of the Mother of the Gods — and consequently of some emotional tension. There is evidence for at least some elements of the Phrygian myth (cf. the ex-voto to Nana); but there is no evidence for self-mutilation.

The orgeones were the proprietors of the Metroon. It was a precinct enclosed by walls, ordinarily kept closed, but opened by the priestess on specified days. Before it was taken over by the orgeones it contained a house. In 220 B.C. there was in it a kitchen which was then in need of repairs. In it was a *naos* in which *eikones* (*ἐν πίνακι*) of officials honored by the association were set up. Before this was a court in which on occasion *stelai* were ordered to be erected. Here it was that the sacrifices and ceremonies peculiar to the cult were performed, the participants feasted, and the processions were ordered.

The orgeones rendered services (*philanthropa*) to the humbler population of the town (*δημοτικοί*),[55] and in this and other ways made their presence felt in the community. They opened their shrine freely to men and women who sought by votive offerings to manifest their gratitude to Men, Artemis Nana, Hermes Hegemon rather than to the Mother of the Gods herself or Attis, her consort. There is, however, no evidence that they sought to increase their membership by proselyting. The *eisiteria* which the priestess sacrificed were the sacrifices customarily offered at the opening of an association's new year on the occasion of the induction of new officers (PW V 2149, Poland, 253). There is, indeed, a case (Poland, 306) in which the absence of the *demotikon* (otherwise non-significant, cf. Poland, 303 ff.) creates a strong presumption that in 178/77 B.C. (IG II^2 1327, l. 33) Ergasion, one of the epimeletai of the association, was an alien. He was probably a well-to-do descendant of one of the alien charter-members. Apart from the Thracians he is the only non-citizen known to have been an orgeon. A *lex sacra* of orgeones, IG II^2 1361 — an enactment of the citizen orgeones of Bendis — demonstrates that associations of this type could and did enlarge their membership by admitting to their ranks

[55] Poland (314) translates *δημοτικοί* "Demengenossen." If demesmen had been meant *δημόται* would have been used.

citizens with the desire and capacity to assume the obligations of the society. Since the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods had aliens on their roll the possibility must be held open that they added Athenians after their incorporation. New members of civic status would, for us, be indistinguishable from old. The large, complex, highly staffed associations of Class B had less of the liens and intimacies of kin which barred newcomers in the old Attic orgeones. The orgeones of Bendis, both citizen and Thracian, had civic shows to stage which made it advisable for them to keep their circle large. As far as we know the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods had no such incentive. As an organization they had probably two conflicting purposes, to impress the public by their spectacular rites, their processions combined with collections, their *philanthropa*, their hospitality to would-be dedicants, and at the same time not to dilute too much the society which ran things. Since we are practically certain that the association possessed a cook-shop (IG II² 1301) we are assured that it also combined feasting with sacrificing, and, consequently, had the same reasons as the old orgeones to set limits to the recipients of portions of the sacrificed animals. The orgeones of the Mother of the Gods wanted to widen the appeal of their patron deity for religious reasons, and to preserve their integrity for social and practical reasons.

There is reference in three decrees to special assessments (*epidoseis*) laid upon members, and it was by these apparently that the society was able to keep the premises in repair. In time of need financial aid was rendered to it by its officers. The secretary who had then held office for twelve years is said in an honorary decree of the year 175/74 B.C. (IG II² 1329) to have advanced money to the association without interest on many occasions when the treasurer was out of town. Presumably his business took him abroad and it may be that the business of other members of the association also was foreign commerce. There is a *prima facie* basis for such a surmise in the fact that the orgeones had their headquarters in the Piraeus and included well-to-do people. This does not mean that members were exempt from the economic reverses to which all

Athenians were liable. Since gennetai are known to have become impoverished ne'er-do-wells (Kirchner, PA 14990) the same is true *a fortiori* of orgeones. To make sure that suitable obsequies should be rendered to deceased members, rich or poor alike apparently, the association possessed a burial fund, to supplement which, when the treasury was empty, the treasurer on occasion provided the wherewithal from his private purse (IG II² 1327 ll. 10 ff. 178/77 B.C.). This is the only association of orgeones for which anything of the sort is attested. It may have come to it with the thiasotai. Burial of their members with proper respect is known to have been one of the functions of certain clubs of aliens in Attica (IG II² 1275, 1277), and there is no reason to think that others did not possess it also (cf. Poland, 506).

(15) A third non-heroic cult with an association of worshippers distinguished by the name of orgeones is that of Dionysos (hence called Dionysiastai) known to us by three of its decrees, two preserved intact (IG II² 1325 ll. 1–33, 185/84 B.C.; IG II² 1326, 176/75 B.C.), the other badly mutilated (IG II² 1325 ll. 34–39); also by a poem (IG II² 2948). These records carry the history of the association over three generations of the family which founded it. The association adopted the practice of heroizing its priest, who held office for life, at the time of his death, and of setting up his statue beside that of Dionysos.[56] The priesthood was hereditary in the family of the founder. The office devolved on the oldest living son of the deceased priest, but his succession had to be approved by the orgeones in plenary assembly. The conjunction of the two forms, hereditary succession and orgeonic approbation, is intelligible if the association had the power to elect its priest should there be no eligible eldest son or should the eldest son be a minor.

[56] Cf. Foucart, Le culte des Héros, 125 f. The heroizing of the first priest of the association, Agathokles, was the work of Dionysios, his son and successor. Perhaps Dionysios had in mind the action taken two hundred years earlier by the orgeones of Amynos when they heroized as Dexion *their* lifelong priest Sophocles. Foucart writes: "Pour leurs membres, c'est-à-dire pour une vingtaine de personnes, Sophocles et Dionysios étaient des Héros; pour les autres Athéniens, leur condition, après leur fin, n'était en rien supérieure à celle de tous les mortels."

Their avowed purpose in heroizing their dead priest was (to quote their own words) "that there should be a memorial of him, and that the fairest, for all time" (*ἵνα ὑπάρχει κάλλιστον ὑπόμνημα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον*). A hero figured in marble in a shrine possessed an immortality of remembrance. The shrine was not a heroon of the priestly family. Agathokles and Dionysios, like Sophocles, belonged to the class of Athenians who had *ἡρία* of their own (cf. Arist. Ath. Pol. 55. 3), and they were doubtless buried in Marathon.

After the death of Agathokles I, at some time prior to 185/84 B.C., Dionysios, his son, upon succeeding to his inheritance and the priesthood,[57] presented the association with a place of meeting, built the temple of Dionysos, equipped it with vessels of gold and silver and the other articles needed for the sacrifices, had the image of Dionysos made (at a cost of 500 drachmas) and set beside it the statue of his father whom the association had just heroized. He also endowed the association with a fund of 1000 drachmas to the proceeds of which the cost of the monthly sacrifices was chargeable (IG II² 1326, 2948). This may have bought him, not a life membership merely, but an eternal membership in the society (cf. Cumont, AJA, 1933, 237). A poem inscribed on a marble tablet somewhere in the premises has outlasted the heroized image in which such high hopes were placed. Translated freely into English verse by John Finley, it discloses the thoughts of Dionysios when giving the god's "company" (*θίασος*) its endowment:

> Shrine, precinct, images and all within
> Did Dionysius dedicate to thee,
> Esteeming wealth less worthy than to win
> A name for ritual propriety.
> Wherefore, O Bacchus, save him and his kin
> And save in kindness all thy company.

How long the association had existed before it received its material equipment we do not know; but it may well be that

[57] His treasurership extending over several years probably antedated his priesthood. It may be conjectured that Solon of Cholargos, honored in the mutilated decree, IG II² 1325 ll. 34 ff., was his successor, having been appointed when Dionysios became priest, or possibly later. In that case he was succeeded by Agathokles II on the death of Dionysios.

Agathokles I was its first life-long priest. In 185/84 B.C. the association had fifteen members. The law of the association was that a member's oldest son might share his father's place before his death and that, should be predecease his father, he in turn might be replaced by his oldest brother. Normally, however, the eldest son did not succeed his father while his father lived.[58] The orgeones of Dionysos were thus a small closed corporation, in which the preponderance of one family — that of the founder — was established in perpetuity. Besides the priest the association had only one other officer, the treasurer, who was, it seems, regularly reappointed for year after year, and might on occasion combine the priesthood with this charge (IG II² 1326, ll. 37 f.). A group of some fifteen men did not need further organization. It assembled monthly for sacrifices, paid for, in part at least, out of the endowment, and held annual meetings for business purposes in Posideon, the month of the rural Dionysia.

This association, which called itself the Dionysiastai, was a small club of prosperous citizens, resident in the Piraeus, but not members of the Piraeic deme. They lacked political, religious, and social affiliations of a corporate character in the deme in which they resided. One of their number in 185/84 B.C., Simon of Poros (IG II- 1325), was at the same time a leader of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods (epimeletes IG II² 1327, *orator* IG II² 1328). This is not surprising. In the second century B.C. Athenians belonged even to more than one genos (Ferguson, Hesperia, VII, 1938, 50 ff.; Meritt, Hesperia, IX, 91 ff.). In the case of Simon we do not need to resort to the idea of consanguinity on his mother's side with one association and on his father's side with another to explain his dual membership. The explanation is much simpler. He or his father or grandfather was undoubtedly of a family which had belonged for some time to the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods and had associated himself with the Agathokles-

[58] The only son listed in the roll for 185/84 is Agathocles II. If we had the roll for ten years later Agathocles II and Dionysios II might very well have been the only father-son combination entered in it. The succession *inter vivos* was in fact limited to the family of the founder of the association.

Dionysios family of Marathon in forming the new, much more exclusive, association of orgeones of Dionysos. Agathokles I seems to have come naturally to an interest in Dionysos, since this god was especially at home in the Marathonian tetrapolis, the region from which he or his antecedents had migrated to the Piraeus. Doubtless the other charter members of the Dionysiastai were not averse to a cult of the god of wine, ecstasy, and release from cares (B. I. Wheeler, Dionysos and Immortality, 40 ff.); but I believe that what they formed was primarily a social club. In calling themselves orgeones they were actuated perhaps by snobbishness — the name had an ancient flavor of respectability —, perhaps by a desire to emphasize the citizenship of the members and the reservation of membership to sons, even in their case to the exclusion of "second" sons. This association has some features in common with the old Attic orgeones of heroes: it was small, simply organized, and single-minded. The heroizing of its founder and priest links it, through unknown intermediaries perhaps, with the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion, who had heroized Sophocles. Dionysios too was a poet, if he did not get someone else to write IG II² 2948 for him. But in other respects it differs sharply from them: it was new, dynastically constituted, and more plutocratic. It lacked a *hestiator*. Though it held a business meeting once a year its reunions were monthly, not annual, and they were obviously not family affairs. There was no place in them for women and children — no indication that these orgeones held family picnics. There were practically as many families as there were individuals in the association, with no demonstrable interlockings by marriage. The fifteen members came from twelve distinct demes. Their bond was not one of kin but of neighborhood in the Piraeus and relationships established by business and activity in public affairs. An Ahnherr, even a fictional one, is unimaginable. Through the passage of time the orgeones may have become more closely knit together, but we know the composition of the group only when the association was new. They had sacrifices at each reunion. We are not told what the nature of these sacrifices was, but we are permitted to sur-

mise that they consisted primarily of libations. There was a *naos* in their hieron but an altar is nowhere mentioned. It was not included in the furnishings given to the shrine by Dionysios. The chances are that the association met in the mansion of Agathokles I in the Piraeus until Dionysios fitted out its courtyard as a temenos, and that it had used theretofore and continued to use thereafter the fine altar which stood in its vestibule.[59] On the other hand the organization of the association was quite different from those of the orgeones (native and Thracian) of Bendis and of the Mother of the Gods; and it had none of the public or popular features of these associations.

Though it has more in common with the associations of Class A than with the associations of Bendis, Cybele, and Hagne Aphrodite, I have put it in Class B because of the lateness of its creation. The indications are that it was founded after 229 B.C. It attached itself to an ancient institution which, however, it adapted to its own needs.

(16) A fourth non-heroic cult with an association of worshippers distinguished by the name of orgeones is that of the Syrian Goddess, who was established in Athens and Athenian Delos, as Hagne Aphrodite. One record alone of this association has reached us, IG II² 1337 (97/96 B.C. found in the Piraeus). The business meeting of this association was held in the month of Skirophorion, not in the month of Munychion, as was the case with the orgeones who in IG II² 1315 and 1329 are said to have offered sacrifices to "the Goddesses," that is to say, on the theory of Foucart (already rejected), to the Syrian Aphrodite and the Mother of the Gods, combined, it is alleged, in a common cult. In the third and second centuries B.C. the Syrian Goddess was far too distinctive a divine personality to be served in a single orgeonic cult with the Mother of the Gods from Pessinus. She carried with her from Hierapolis to Delos and Athens rites and connotations peculiarly her own.[60]

[59] The foundations of the house of Dionysios have been unearthed close by the temenos of Dionysos, which, in fact, seems to have been the courtyard of the building. For their identification see Koehler, Ath. Mitt. 1884, 296 ff. They indicate that he had quite a spacious residence. In its vestibule there was a good big altar (Doerpfeld, Ath. Mitt. 1884, 282 and plates XIII and XIV).

[60] Cf. Laidlaw, A History of Delos, 225 f. If, as Ed. Meyer maintains (Gesch. d. Alt.² I 2, pp. 650 ff.), the Syrian Goddess (Atargatis) is *die Göttin die durch den Attisdienst charakterisiert ist*, i.e. the Mother of the Gods, who, he argues, was carried from Anatolia to Hierapolis in the days of the Hittite Empire, the thousand years of their separate history since then had sufficed to destroy all consciousness of their original identity. Both submitted to the processes of conver-

In Delos she was first given public recognition and a public priest between 122 and 118 B.C.[61] Her acceptance in the metropolis doubtless synchronized with her establishment on the island. The formation of a private association of Athenian orgeones may have anticipated her public recognition, but it is improbable that it antedated the first setting up of the private cult with a Hierapolitan priest (six of whose names are known)[62] in Delos in 128/27 B.C. (Inscr. d. Délos, 2226). The orgeones of Hagne Aphrodite are thus, so far as founding goes, the latest association of this type to be considered in this article.[63]

The most striking innovation of this association is that, while its members were apparently citizens, the priestess, invariably selected in earlier associations, usually by lot, from the womenfolk of the members, was a foreigner, in 97/96 B.C. a certain Nikasis, daughter of Philiskos, of Corinth. Like the Egyptian whom the temple administrator at Priene was required by law to provide so that the sacrifice to Isis should be performed "in an expert way,"[64]

---

gence active in Hellenistic thought but retained their essential peculiarities of personality and cult. Cf. Nock, AJP, 1942, 223 f.

[61] Roussel, Délos, 256 ff.; Athenian Tribal Cycles, 162 ff.

[62] Sarapis at Delos had much the same career, cf. Roussel, Les cultes égyptiens à Délos, 71 ff.; Nock, Conversion, 50 ff. Dow (HTR 1937 198 ff.) shows that Athens had a public priest of Sarapis before 166 B.C. (IG II^2 4692).

[63] The orgeonai of Belela, known to us from a record of the early third century A.D. (IG II^2 2361), are an altogether different association from any thus far considered. Hesychius equates ὀργεώναι with ἱέρειαι, but our orgeonai are males and the priestesses of their cult are listed separately. It is obviously a neo-Attic creation which has little historical continuity with the ancient institution whose name, slightly modified in form, it adopted. In addition to Belela it served the three associated goddesses, Oraia (Mother of the Gods), Aphrodite, and Dea Syria. Its members numbered 18. Orgeonai seems to be a collective title for a group of sacred officiants like orgeones in the Hymn to Apollo, 389. The name may in fact be a poetic reminiscence. Their full title was orgeonai and ankonophoroi (vase-bearers). Probably IG II^2 1351 belongs to this society.

[64] Hiller von Gärtringen, Inschriften von Priene, 138, No. 195; cf. Nock, Conversion, 55, Graillot, Le culte de Cybèle, 74, Plut. Nicias, 13, 4, Tac. Annals, II 54. We do not know where Philiskos, the father of Nikasis, lived. Just as there were Olynthioi after 348 (AJA 1935, 155) and Delioi after 166 (Roussel et Launey, Inscr. de Délos, 1700 and notes), so there were, it seems, Korinthioi after 146 B.C. It may be that he had his home in Attica itself. IG II^2 Part III Fasc. 2, when it becomes available, may enable us to say whether Corinthians died there between 146 and 44 B.C. (cf. John Day, Econ. Hist. of Athens under Roman Domination, 79 ff., 213). There was no Corinthian among the foreign ephebes known to have been enrolled in the Athenian corps between 119/18 and 39/38 B.C. (O. W. Reinmuth, The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebia, 21 ff.). During this interval, for all we know, Corinthians may have lived in Korinthia, attached to local cults, of which one of Aphrodite was famous (PW I 2740 f.). Others must have been living in foreign cities (Delos, for example, cf. Roussel, Délos col. Athén. 85) when Corinth was sacked, or survived the catastrophe by escaping abroad (PWK XVI 1197, CAH VIII 304, 644). The probability is that these, whether living in

she was, I imagine, chosen because of her professional competence, and held an appointment without limit of time. For a similar reason, their *scientia peregrina et externa*, the priestesses of Ceres in Rome were imported, ordinarily from Naples or Velia (Cicero, Pro Balbo, 55). It is, however, possible that in an association of orgeones founded as late as 122/18 B.C. aliens were enrolled as members. At this time the social system of Athens disintegrated: citizens intermarried with foreigners, foreigners were enrolled in the ephebe corps, the genê were no longer mutually exclusive, citizens and aliens consorted freely as eranistai (IG II² 1335, 2358), and the ancient stock of family names was badly corrupted (Ferguson, Hell. Ath. 422 ff., Dow, HTR 1937, 216 ff. Day, Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination, 76 f.). The example set by the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods may have worked on the orgeones of Hagne Aphrodite: it was not difficult to advance from the epimeleia of Ergasion to the priesthood of Nikasis. In the decree which has reached us Nikasis was honored by the society on the occasion of a report presented to it by her regarding the sacrifices which she had offered on its behalf "to Aphrodite the Syrian and the other gods οἷς πάτριον ἦν." Among these other gods was undoubtedly Hadad, her consort at her home in Bambyke (Hierapolis) in Syria.

IV. We have only two orgeonic decrees enacted after ca. 130 B.C. (Nos. (14) and (16). For IG II² 1351 see above n. 63) — both by associations in Class B. Apart from official records preserved on stone the only sources for the history of the orgeones are the lexicographical definitions of the name, the ancient laws, casual references in the classical literature, and the datable ex-votos found in the shrines. Of these the ex-votos alone are of service for the period following 130 B.C. Only two hiera of orgeones have been excavated, the Amyneion on the west slope of the Acropolis (Class A) and the Metroon in the Piraeus (Class B), the former by competent archaeologists, the latter in 1855 by a detachment of soldiers. The Amyneion has yielded an inscribed votive offering made as late as 130 B.C., not by the orgeones, but by a private individual (IG II² 4457). The shrine was, however, in use in Roman times (Koerte, Ath. Mitt. 1893, 233, 244; 1896, 292, 309), for anything we know, by the orgeones. The inscribed ex-votos from the Metroon in the Piraeus are listed in note 52; they prove the existence of the orgeones as late as 163/64 A.D. The association probably endured to the end of paganism. Two of the other as-

Athens or elsewhere, retained their ethnika even though their polis was nonexistent. Nikasis may have learned the technique of her job at Delos.

sociations in Class A appear, the one (No. 1) after an interval of nearly 200 and the other (No. 10) after an interval of about 50 years; the rest (omitting the orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion (No. 7)) appear only once in our records. Long disappearances and single appearances are inevitable, and, in themselves, of no significance, in a record so defective and subject to chance as ours is. Even though they were small, associations which were self-perpetuating, and sustained by endowments which belonged, not to them, but to the heroes and gods whom they worshipped and consequently were inalienable, had a high survival value, especially since the feelings and ideas which they embodied, being undefined dogmatically, could renew their strength by changing with the times. All that we can say as to the end of the orgeones is that, with the exception of those of the Mother of the Gods, they drop out of our sight in Roman times.

V. The establishment of orgeones of the Class B type added new associations to those already existing; but it is probable that in the fourth, third and second centuries B.C. the type represented by Class A preponderated throughout Attica. With two exceptions (Nos. 8 and 9) the stones with records of the old Attic orgeones have been found here and there in Athens or its environs; but we must not conclude from their provenience that these associations were primarily a phenomenon of urban or suburban life. They do not figure in the *reliquiae* of Attic comedy or in the Characters of Theophrastus. Aristophanes had other fish to fry and Menander depicted a society to which they did not ordinarily belong. They were too normal and old (without being bizarre) to attract the attention of the comedians. Theophrastos suited himself in selecting the illustrations of his Types and it just happens that he fails to mention either gennetai or orgeones. The chances are that most of the old Attic orgeones with their Hosts and their decorous sacrifices and feasts had their precincts in the demes (Pollux, 8 107), and either published no records [65] or inscribed

[65] The "ancient decrees" of the new inscription from the Areopagus were apparently left unpublished between ca. 450 and ca. 275 B.C.

them on stones which have perished. Attica was alive with heroes and heroines, many of them nameless (cf. IG II² 1195, 1356, 1358; Hesperia, VII, 1938, 1 ff.), others with sufficient personality to be given eventually a name (cf. above, p. 74, n. 15).

With what ideas or feelings in mind did the Athenian burghers with their wives, children and female attendants assemble in their precincts to sacrifice and feast? The purposes by which their forebears were actuated in founding the associations in the first place is one thing, and they must be sought in the conditions of pre-Solonian times; the motives of those participating in the reunions in classical and post-classical times is another thing. They are disclosed to us only in the name of the official (*hestiator*) by which they were headed.[66] The *hestiasis* was the name-giving function of the association, so far at least as its administration was concerned. The sacrifices were offered to the heroes or heroines or to "the god" or "goddess" (in reality apotheosized heroes or heroines) on behalf of the orgeones and their families, and endowments and contributions (IG II² 1252 l. 11) had to be available to provide the sacrificial animals; but the picnic, the barbecue, was probably the main attraction. The prayers which accompanied the sacrifices were directed to the deity or deities and they may have been quite general, a supplication that τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἥρωας or θεούς might be καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς for the orgeones.

The passage from Isaeus (II 14) quoted above (p. 70) shows that the orgeones possessed a roll of their members. This, of course, had to be kept up to date by the omission of the dead and the addition of the ἔκγονοι (IG II² 1361). Isaeus' client was an adult at the time of his enrollment, but since he was an adopted son his legal father could not present him to his orgeones until he had adopted him. In the "ancient decree" the sons of orgeones, though they participated in the feast,

[66] Athenaeus (V, 185e, Gulick, Loeb Classics, II 320; cf. above, p. 71, n. 12), in speaking of the "so-called orgeonic δεῖπνα," defines *the* function of the orgeones no more than he defines that of the phylae in speaking of the φυλετικὰ δεῖπνα. Athenaeus, a native of Naukratis, undoubtedly knew of these feasts, not from personal knowledge, but from the sources which he used. We have, therefore, no reason to conclude from his text that they survived at ca. 200 A.D.

were not yet orgeones. Hence it is probable that sons were enrolled only when they came of age. If registration were permissible to others than sons, the citation by the orator of his client's admission to the society would have had no evidential value. It meant for the orator and the jurors a recognition of his filial relation to the orgeon by whom he was proposed for membership.

The admission of members to some of the associations of Class B was, or was later put, on a different basis. It is known, for example, that the citizen orgeones of Bendis, some time in the second half of the fourth century, opened their doors to any (citizen) who wished to assume the obligations of their association; but this was done relatively late and was obviously a departure, motivated by the public duty which this society performed (above, p. 103). In Class B other departures were probably not uncommon. The orgeones of the Mother of the Gods, for example, admitted a limited number of aliens at the time of their organization, while the Dionysiastai moved in the other direction and gave certain priorities of admissions to the oldest son alone (above, p. 117). What the orgeones of Bendis and the Mother of the Gods did once they could, of course, do again. Whether or not they did so we do not know.

As to the *raison d'être* of the original associations the latest summary expression of opinion which I have seen is that given by Ziebarth in PWK s.v. ὀργεῶνες. It runs as follows: "Ihre Aufgabe ist der gemeinsame Kult eines Gottes oder auch eines Heros durch Besorgung der νομιζόμενα, so Bruck Totenteil 234. Sie sind nicht Geschlechtsgenossen mit eponymen Ahnherren, sondern ersetzen ihren Genossen die fehlende Geschlechtsgemeinschaft durch den Heros, z. B. Amynos oder Egretes oder Hypodektes den sie als Ahnherrn und Heros verehren. Wie der Sippenkult Zusammenhang und Macht der Geschlechter ausdrückt, so schliessen sich auf ähnliche Weise Leute ohne Geschlechter, kleine Leute oder Fremde zu Orgeonenverbänden zusammen, die nach Brucks ueberzeugenden Ausführungen oft den fehlenden Sippenkult ersetzen. . . . Was das Geschlecht seinen Mitgliedern bietet, z. B. Bestattungsgeld, Totenpflege, Hilfe bei der Adoption, das leisten auch die Orgeonen für ihre

Mitglieder (Bruck 237 ff.). — — Der Unterschied zwischen den Vereinen der ὀργεῶνες, der θιασῶται und der ἐρανισταί verschwindet später völlig."

There is much in this summarization which provokes comment. First as to νομιζόμενα: Harpocration assigns to ὀργιάζειν two meanings, "to sacrifice" and "perform customary rites." Suidas equates it with τὰ τῶν θεῶν ὄργια τελεῖν, adding that ὄργια means μυστήρια καὶ νόμιμα. The words ὀργιάζειν and ὄργια do not appear in the records of the orgeones (cf. below, Appendix 1). "Customary rites" are commonly rites of burial, "all that custom requires after the funeral" (ὅσα νομίζεται μετὰ τὴν ἐκφοράν. Diog. Laert. V 61); but, as pointed out above (p. 62, n. 3), they are also more comprehensively rites which are appropriate to any cultus, and such they must be when associated by the lexicographers with ὀργιαζειν, and what is more important for this study, such they were in the only instance in which the term employed by Suidas as a synonym for νομιζόμενα is used in the orgeonic records. Νόμιμα in IG II² 2948 means simply "Bacchic rites." Neither in the official records of the associations nor elsewhere do we find anything to suggest that the orgeones collectively acted for or with the next of kin (προσήκοντες, cf. [Demosth.], XLIII 58) in rendering obsequies to the dead, and their possession of Bestattungsgeld is demonstrable only in one instance in Class B — a decree of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods (IG II² 1327, 178/77 B.C.; cf. above, p. 115). This is an inadequate basis for generalizing. It is certainly risky to transfer to the old Attic orgeones of heroes data attested only for an association organized to carry on in Attica the worship of a goddess so alien in cult-practices as Cybele. The possession of a "burial fund" has, moreover, no implications for a cult of the dead. There is no reference to Totenpflege in any of our records unless it be in the hesitant item appended by Harpocration (repeated by Suidas) to his definition of orgeones (above, p. 63). The lexicographer suggests that the word orgeones was possibly used later (i.e., subsequent to the date of the classical text in which he had found orgeones mentioned) to designate associations formed to do honor to the dead (ἐπὶ τιμῇ τῶν ἀποθανόντων), "as," he says, "is

to be seen from the last will and testament of Theophrastos." His knowledge of Theophrastos' will was apparently defective. We have this document (Diog. Laert., V, 51 ff.). In it Theophrastos designated ten men to live as a community of philosophers attached to the hieron of the Muses in which the school of Aristotle had its sacral headquarters, but he did not designate its members as orgeones. He lists them individually, calls them his friends and joint holders of the property, but gives them no collective title. They were undoubtedly thiasotai in fact if not in name (cf. Wilamowitz, Ant. von Karystos, 263 ff.). It is the clear implication of the definition reaching us through Harpocration (and Suidas) that the orgeones of the text in which the word was found were not an association in honor of the dead: they were something different, "worshippers of gods and heroes." The possibility is simply raised, on inadequate evidence, that associates joined together to do honor to the dead were so named in later times.

Returning to Ziebarth's summarization, I should like to query whether, even if we should concede that an Amynos, or an Egretes or a Hypodektes could be regarded as an Ahnherr of orgeones, we can possibly regard "the Heroines" of Hesperia, XI, 282, no. 55 as capable of playing such a rôle (cf. Latte, Gnomon, 1927, 42: Latte denies that the orgeones were Sippenersatz). Yet "the Heroines" were the sole objects of the cult of one of the two associated κοινά of orgeones of this record. With this query and the larger question which it raises, Does the cult of heroes and of heroines inherently involve a cult of the dead? I turn the investigation over to Professor Nock. But before doing so I venture to challenge two further statements of Ziebarth. He alludes to the orgeones as "Leute ohne Geschlechter, kleine Leute oder Fremde." Certainly they were not gennetai. They were much too closely knit together by bonds of real kinship to be placed in the same category with, or to be conceived as imitations of, "the so-called genê," which might be so large and were so lacking in ties of blood that it is only in the case of their leading families (οἶκοι), when they had any (cf. Hesperia, VII 43 f.), that they possessed anything (apart from cultus) in common with orgeones (cf. above, n. 37).

In Athens the Ahnherr seems to belong to the associations (genê, phylae) in which the kinship of the members with one another was fictional rather than real. I hope that I have shown that the old Attic orgeones were not "kleine Leute" in the sense that thetes were; nor were they aliens. If I were to classify them in Solonian terms I should call them zeugitai. Ziebarth affirms that "the distinction between orgeones, thiasotai and eranistai disappeared later wholly." I am convinced that, despite the anomaly presented by the Thracians and the transaction by which the association of the Mother of the Gods absorbed an enclave of aliens, the name orgeones retained a tone of its own until at least 130 B.C. Far from proving the identity of thiasotai and orgeones, the records of the Metroon in the Piraeus, when properly interpreted (cf. Appendix 4), indicate that the distinctiveness of the two names was recognized.

It is easier to say what the old Attic orgeones were not, and to define their social and economic status, than to determine what they were originally. But let me say what this study has led me to think. In the second article of this pair Nock will urge that the heroes and heroines were not all of one type, that some of them were dead men and women, that others were faded gods and goddesses, and that many of them were simply gods and goddesses "in a small way." The complete absence of chthonic ritual in the orgeonic records and the universal use by the orgeones of non-chthonic rites and sacrifices, while they do not exclude the idea that the heroes and heroines of these organizations were dead men and women, put the burden of proof — of which there is no vestige — on those who affirm that this is what they were. Practically all the rites used in the cult of the dead (E. Rohde, Psyche[8], 149 ff.) are violated by the practices attested in case no. (1), above, 78 cf. below, 144: *θύειν* not *ἐναγίζειν*, *βωμός* not *ἐσχάρα*, victims of any color not black-skinned animals, sacrifice by daylight not after dark, eating of flesh of offerings not holocaust, and worship in a common hieron not at the place of alleged burial. There can be no doubt that the Hero (Echelos) and the Heroines were worshipped by the orgeones with the rites of Olympians and

that these rites date back to ancient times; but the rites of sacrifice do not disclose infallibly the character of their object. In view of the evidence collected and assessed by Nock (below, 147 f.) we can only say that, if these heroic persons were not akin to the Olympians in nature, their cult resisted with complete success the normative processes which tended to give to Totenkult its special ritual of sacrifice. A positive index that the hero Egretes was not thought of as a dead person may be found in the fact that his chapel (ἱερόν) was situated in the dwelling house in which the tenant of the orgeones in 306/05 B.C. presumably lived (above, 80).

There is not the slightest intimation that Echelos, Egretes, Amynos, and Hypodektes were ever great deities who had fallen by neglect to their lowly state. It remains for us to classify them and their like as small deities, each attached to a definite spot (which need not be always the place of worship, above, p. 79), and thought by persons living near-by to have supernatural powers for good or evil which these persons should control by suitable sacrifices (below, 162 ff.). There is no evidence that these persons, who organized themselves on an exclusive basis as "sacrificing associates" (orgeones) to ensure the regularity and continuity of these sacrifices, ever thought that they were the offspring of the heroes or heroines in question. Those of them who were nameless and known simply as the Hero or the Heroines, as was the case with the objects of orgeonic cult in our "ancient decree," can hardly have been thought of as capable of parenthood. With the lapse of time belief in the potency for good or evil of these little deities may have waned and the heroes and heroines become essentially symbols; but nonetheless the sacrifice went on, sustained by tradition, so powerful in all religious matters, and by the corporate life which developed among the "sacrificing associates" themselves. Marriage in Athens was always a matter of family arrangement and based on the acquaintance of families one with another. Propinquity was an efficacious coadjutor of Hymen. The families constituting the typical association of orgeones were ordinarily neighbors and necessarily intimate with one another. Membership being hereditary, the members came in time to

take on the aspect of one large family, and the names used by the individual families came to assume a family aspect. There must have been something deliberate about name-giving to account for the homonymity displayed by the orgeones of No. (8) above. The annual reunion of orgeones was thus in a sense a family party. Since the group was small, the kinship real, and the people just normal simple folk they did not bother about a pedigree or the fiction of a common ancestor (cf. Busolt, Griech. Staatskunde, I 252, 525). The leading men of the group of families took turns in acting as hosts on the occasion of reunions, and their name, Hosts (*hestiatores*), and their acceptance as heads of the association for the year, are *prima facie* evidence that the feasts (*hestiaseis*) which accompanied the sacrifices (*thysiai*) were, early and late, an essential part of the ceremonies. The Hero or Heroine doubtless got his share of the victims — this was presumably burned on the altar — but the main portion of the flesh went to the orgeones and their sons and womenfolk — this was roasted and eaten in the precinct. A holocaust, the most characteristic practice of a chthonic cult, was unthinkable and unheard of. The precinct was naturally equipped to enable the *hestiator* to do his job and the orgeones to have their feast as conveniently and comfortably as circumstances permitted. In the age that lay back of Solon, an age of piety and of the dominance of the idea that every permanent association, private and public, was based on kin, the organization of orgeones among the middle-class farmers of Attica was natural, not necessarily imitative, and was carried out widely in town and village; for, as has been said already, Attica was alive with the little deities whom it was their function to cultivate. An injunction, traced back doubtfully to Draco (Porphyr. de abstin. 4, 22), laid upon the Athenians the duty of "worshipping publicly the gods and the heroes that dwelt in the land, according to the custom of their fathers." Upon the orgeones, small self-perpetuating groups of neighbors and kinsmen, privately organized and supported, devolved the task of maintaining good relations with the multitude of Attic heroes and heroines whose supernatural activity was locally limited and hence did not concern the people as a

whole. The state might concern itself with a Theseus, but lesser heroic personalities were left to them and to the larger more aristocratic societies of gennetae and to local territorial organizations like the Marathonian Tetrapolis. These however practised not only their cult but also that of major deities. The orgeones were more single-minded in their devotions.

To end with a further negative: there was nothing Dionysiastic or orgiastic about the religious or social practices of the old Attic orgeones. The religions sponsored by the new orgeones, notably those of the Mother of the Gods, evoked protests in Athens on the stage and elsewhere because of their incitations to emotional outbursts and superstitious crudities; but it may be that the orgeones checked and regulated these rather than promoted them (cf. above p. 111). The *sodales* of the civic cult of *Magna Mater* in Rome were members of the governing society. Cato the Elder was one of their number (Cic. de senect. XIII 45). Athens had no governing society and the state had nothing to do with her private association of *cultores* of the Mother of the Gods. But the Athenian orgeones and the Roman *sodales* had more in common than Graillot (Le culte de Cybèle, 90) was aware of when he wrote "Les sodalitiés nobles ne risquaient pas de dégénérer en orgéons."

APPENDIX 1

THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE WORD ὀργεῶνες AND ITS USE BY HOMER, AESCHYLUS, AND OTHER POETS

The lexicographers connect the word ὀργεῶνες with ὄργια and ὀργιάζειν and interpret it in the light of the meanings of these words: μυστήρια is exegesis of ὄργια. These interpretations may repeat accurately enough what Greeks of later times thought; but in their own records the orgeones always speak of θυσίαι and θύειν, never of ὄργια and ὀργιάζειν. The latter pair of words seems to me to have been brought into the picture by folk-etymologizing because of their homonymity with ὀργεῶνες. We cannot depend upon guesses of this sort for the significance of the word ὀργεῶνες (*ὀργεῖς; cf. above, p. 82) in the centuries lying back of Solon. Harpocration and Suidas, in fact, record other guesses. Otto Hoffmann (Mitt. der Schles. Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, 13/14 Breslau, 1911, 187), cited by E. F. Bruck (Totenteil und Seelgerät im griechischen Recht, 237, n. 2), dissociates the word wholly from ὄργια and ὀργιάζειν (which are probably cognate with ἔρδω), and derives it, by way of ὀργάων and ὀργά, from ἔργω (enclose), thus enabling him to assign to ὀργεῶνες the primitive meaning of members of a Verband or union. We could come thus to the idea that orgeones were so named because they were closed groups.

The lexicographers report that the poets used the word with the meaning "priest" (ἱερεύς) simply, noting as examples Aesch. frg. 144 (Ποταμοῦ Καΐκου χαῖρε πρῶτος ὀργεών, Εὐχαῖς δὲ σώζοις δεσποτὰς παιωνίαις), and Antimachos, Lyde, fig. 67, ed. Wyss, (Καβάρνους θῆκεν ἀγακλέας ὀργεῶνας). We can add two further examples: Hom. Hymn to Apollo, 389 (Καὶ τότε δὴ κατὰ θυμὸν ἐφράζετο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων Οὕς τινας ἀνθρώπους ὀργίονας εἰσαγάγοιτο, Οἳ θεραπεύσονται Πυθοῖ ἔνι πετρηέσσῃ), and Hermesianax, Leontion, line 19 — in the stanza placing Antiope-Deiope and Mousaios in an Eleusinian setting as in the fifth century vase painting published by Richter, AJA, 1939, 1 ff. In this line a corruption of the text occurs (the Mss. have Ράριον οργιωνανεμωιδιαποιπνωιουσα Δημητρα) which makes any restoration uncertain. Hermann restores ὀργειῶνι νόμῳ, taking the word as an adjective with the meaning sacerdotal (cf. Gulick, Athen. XIII 597d, Loeb Classics, VI 220, n. a).

In the Hymn to Apollo (see for the form above, 83) and the Lyde of Antimachos the word is a collective nontechnical plural and it is in this same sense that it was used by Aelian in his Περὶ Προνοίας in a passage cited by Suidas (s.v. ὀργεῶνας): Τῶν ἐξ Ἐλευσῖνος ὀργεώνων εἷς.

Neither in Delphi, Paros, or Eleusis was there a staff of religious officials entitled orgeones. The *cultores sacri* at Delphi and Eleusis are well known by name. In Paros the officials were called Kabarnoi (IG XII 5 292). Hesychius encountered somewhere (cf. n. 63) the form ὀργεώναι — a collective feminine plural perhaps — and ascribed to it the meaning ἱέρειαι. There is no evidence in any of these texts for an individualized priest called an orgeon. Is this usage demonstrated by the Aeschylean text? I think not. The word is commonly accented ὀργεών and taken as a singular. It may now (above, 82) be accented ὀργέων and taken as a genitive plural. The πρῶτος, without a further context, is ambiguous. It might mean "first" orgeon as πρῶτος ἄρχων in Athens means first archon; or it might mean "first" of the orgeis-orgeones, as in the phrase πρῶτος τῆς πόλεως it means first man of the state. So taken it would imply a group and πρῶτος ὀργεών, ὀργέων would stand to this group in the relation in which *hestiator* stands to the Athenian orgeones with whom Aeschylus was of course familiar. It is only when πρῶτος is taken to mean "earliest," as is equally possible in a tragedy, i.e. the first of the series of successive annual or lifelong orgeones, that it would compel us to translate orgeon as priest ἁπλῶς. In that event the etymology of ὀργεών proposed by Otto Hoffmann would be inappropriate.

Professor Whatmough has very kindly allowed me to quote from a letter written to me at my request as follows: "As to the etymology the evidence is only presumptive. The epigraphic usage, as you say, lends no weight to the traditional, generally accepted, derivation from the same root as ὄργια. Hence Otto Hoffmann's suggestion holds the field, being at least possible; but only a context in which the required meaning (on that etymology) is certain and clear would be decisive enough to be convincing."

In these circumstances it is prudent not to attach any etymological significance to the term orgeones, but to derive its notion of exclusiveness from the well-established heredity of membership in the associations which it primarily denotes, and from the reservation of orgeonic activities to the members enrolled at any given time. If their name were derived from the same root as ὄργια they would be simply rite-performing associates. Ὄργια, of course, are intrinsically not orgies, but "acts religiously done."

APPENDIX 2

THE THIASOS OF THE ETIONIDAI

Lately in a mid-fifth century B.C. inscription from the base of an altar set up by it in the vicinity of the Piraeus ὁ θιάσος [Ἐτ]ιονιδῶν has come to light (Palaios, Polemon, I, 1929, 107 ff.; cf. Guarducci, Riv. di Fil. 1935, 337 ff. and Mem. Accad. d. Lincei, Cl. di Sc. Mor., vol. VI, Serie VI, 45, 52, 90). Guarducci concludes from the patronymic that the Etionidai were one of "the so-called genê," and goes on to argue that the thiasos, one of the units of a phratry, consisted of the gennetai in the phratry in question who belonged to the genos of the Etionidai. I find this argument difficult to accept. The members of a thiasos of a phratry were those who knew a man's family best, i.e. his closest of kin (IG II² 1237, ll. 68 ff., 2344): it is doubtful whether these were to be found among his fellow gennetai (cf. n. 37). The segregation in a phratry of the gennetai of a particular genos, assuming it to be possible, seems irreconcilable with gentile interests. It was inevitable for the gennetai to be fractionalized by their dispersion among the Kleisthenian phylae and phratries; why increase yet further gentile disunity by, so to speak, incorporating the fractions? It is to be observed that most of the names of phratries known to us are patronymics (Class. Stud. Capps, 154; Guarducci, Mem. Accad. d. Lincei, 8). An alternative explanation, therefore, is that the Etionidai were a phratry and the thiasos one of its ordinary subdivisions. It is true that the inscriptions thus far known designate these thiasoi as Ἀγνοθέο θίασος, Ἀντιφάνος θίασος, Διογένος θίασος, κτλ. (IG II² 2345), or even more informally as phrateres οἱ μετὰ τοῦ δεῖνα (IG II² 2723; in Theophr. Char. XXX 16 ὁ δεῖνα is seemingly called ὁ χειρίζων), or as phrateres simply (IG II² 2344); but the departure from the normal is the same whether the Etionidai were a genos or a phratry, since in either case the thiasos is taken to be a thiasos of a phratry. Why, then, should it call itself a thiasos of gennetai? In the records of the poletai (Hesperia, X 14 ff., cf. above p. 83) the κοινὸν φρατέρων Μεδοντιδῶν was the phratry as a whole, of which the name was Medontidai (id. p. 21). What tells against this alternative explanation is the article ὁ. This indicates that the thiasos was not one of many thiasoi but a unique association, the Thiasos of the Etionidai. Is there yet a third explanation?

However the thiasos was manned it could not be called a thiasos of Herakles and remain a unit of a phratry. The deities of phratries were of course Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria. Herakles has no

known connection with the phratries or the Apaturia. Yet Palaios thinks that the altar which the thiasos of the Etionidai set up was an altar of Herakles. He does this because the base came from the area in which the tetrakomia of Herakles had its centre and because he reads the final letters of line 1 as -κλεο̣[ς], which he restores as ['Ερα]-κλέο[ς]. Unfortunately for once Meritt does not have a squeeze. He writes, "It seems to me clear from the photograph that this, -κλεο̣[ς], is not the reading. I should have to take the K on faith, but there is certainly a letter between the E and the O. To judge from the spacing and the visible stroke, it looks to me like iota." We might therefore restore ['Ερα]κλείο[ι] or ['Ερα]κλείο; or some form of ['Ερά]κλειο[ς] — a proper name. Accepting Herakleion on the weight of the provenience of the stone we should conclude that the altar was set up in the shrine of Herakles. Without examining the stone an attempt to restore the inscription is labor lost; but what follows would make sense: [Τôι]'Ε̣[τίονι or, neglecting the ε̣, [Τὸν *βομὸν ἐν τ*]ộ[ι hερα]κλείο[ι | *καθ*]*ίδρυε ὁ θίασος* ['Ε]*τιονιδῶν*. The thiasos could be an association of men living in Etioneia, named the Etionidai, formed for the worship of Herakles, and have nothing whatsoever to do with a phratry.

[Dow finds a trace of the K on the photograph, inquires whether what Meritt thinks looks like an iota cannot be a tau, and sees some vestiges of the theta before the first iota of line 2.]

APPENDIX 3

SPACING, ETC., IN HESPERIA, XI (1942), PP. 282–287, NO. 55

BY

STERLING DOW

Regularity. The letters, when plotted on graph paper, are seen to be spaced fairly regularly throughout the entire inscription. The principle of syllabification (i.e. of ending lines with the ends of syllables) is certainly violated once (line 13) and probably again in line 17. The final nu should probably be kept in line 24, according to the requirements of spacing. Only these three lines appear to violate the principle. The fact that no other lines do so may be due partly to accident; in the second decree the ends of most of the lines crowd close to the right margin. Except as noted below, Meritt's restorations are upheld by study of the spacing.

Lines 18–19. Space certainly existed at the end of line 18 for one letter more than is now restored there. This is apparent from the plotting of all the letters in relation to a vertical line drawn $2\frac{1}{2}$ letter-spaces from the margin next the right edge of the stone. On the other hand, the beginning of line 19, when similarly plotted, is seen to be unduly crowded. Hence the upsilon of *νοῖς* should be moved from the beginning of line 19 back to the end of line 18.

Line 20. There was space for the first nu of *ὀργεώ[ν|ων]* at the end of line 19, and this arrangement (the editor's) here appears to be preferable, despite the principle of syllabification. The number of letters to be restored at the beginning of line 20 depends on the degree of regularity of the spacing at the beginnings of lines. A line drawn $6\frac{1}{2}$ spaces from the left margin, with the preserved intervening letters plotted as accurately as possible, shows that in the first decree (lines 1–11) no line has more than 7 or less than $5\frac{1}{2}$ letters in the $6\frac{1}{2}$ spaces. In the second decree (line 12 being taken as the norm for the whole), line 17 has $6\frac{1}{2}$, line 13 has 6, other lines have 7 (lines 14, 18, 19, 21?, 22?); only lines 15 and 16 have 8 letters. Line 15 has three iotas, and the fact that they actually require less than one half space each accounts for the excess. Line 16 thus remains the one gross irregularity.

In line 20 the editor's version has 9 letters in the space in question, all but the last of which (omicron, dotted) are restored. One of the restored letters is mu, which in this inscription (though I have counted

it as one) actually occupies the space of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ letters. Hence the restoration ὀργεώ[ν|ων μετ' αὐτ]ο̣ύς can hardly be accepted.

In conformity with the neighboring lines of the second decree, the number of letters in line 20 may be put down as preferably 7, i.e. ὀργεώ[ν|ων . .^{4}. .]ο̣υς. In place of the 4 spaces left blank here, $3\frac{1}{2}$ (or even 3) could be admitted; or $4\frac{1}{2}$ (or even 5, as in line 16). In view of the regularity of the inscription as a whole, more should not be considered.

Line 24. Only the second half of the line is preserved. The editor has restored the beginning identically with line 12, but it should be noted that the same letters (all preserved) in line 12 occupy three full spaces *more* than in line 24. This fact, taken in conjunction with the fact that the (preserved) second half of line 24 is spaced so loosely that it contains $1\frac{1}{2}$ letters *less* than the corresponding portion of line 12, raises the question whether the restoration in line 24 is correct. At present $24\frac{1}{2}$ letters are restored in a space where (again judging by the preserved end of the line) about 19 would be expected. Since the restoration seems to be inevitable the scribe may have omitted some letters accidentally.

APPENDIX 4

THE RECORDS AND SHRINE OF THE ORGEONES OF THE MOTHER OF THE GODS

The attribution of IG II² 1316 to this association is contestable; the attribution of the rest is assured. All have this in common that in the texts of their decrees they call, or may have called (IG II² 1301), themselves orgeones. 1315 is linked with 1314, 1327, 1328 I, 1328 II and 1334 in that it like them belongs to an association of which the ἀγορὰ κυρία was held on an unspecified day of Munychion. It is linked with 1316 by the conjunction with the priestess of a man, in 1316 her husband, in 1315 probably her husband, who was crowned with her or by her without indication of the office he held, or that he held any office. This association of husband and priestess was probably an Atticized form of *la dualité du sacerdoce oriental* of which Graillot (Le culte de Cybèle, 76, 251) speaks. 1316, on the other hand, was voted in Hekatombaion, at a meeting which, however, is not designated as κυρία. Simon of Poros links 1327, in which the Metroon is mentioned, with 1328 I and II; and 1328 I is, in turn, proved to be a decree of orgeones of the Mother of the Gods by the references in it, as in 1329, to ἀγερμοί and στρώσεις, rites characteristic of the cult of the goddess and her consort Attis.

There is more than a good chance that IG II² 1301 (220/19 B.C.), which comes from a stone found in the Piraeus, belongs to the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods. The month of the business meeting (Munychion), the *epidoseis*, the epimeletai, the crown of olive, the Goddess, are all consonant with this attribution; and there is nothing which tells against it. If this is correct, the association had a cookshop (*mageireion*); cf. H. Graillot, Le culte de Cybèle, 506; Judeich, Topographie von Athen², 454.

The idea that two associations are concerned arose because of the following observations (Foucart, Assoc. relig. chez les Grecs, 99 ff., 198, no. 11): (1) that a dedication attributed to the Metroon in the Piraeus was addressed to Aphrodite Urania, and (2) that in IG II² 1316 the object of the sacrifices is "the goddess," as in 1314, 1328 I, 1328 II and 1334, whereas in 1315 and 1329 (which was voted on the same day as 1328 II) the object is "the goddesses" and in 1327 it is "the gods." It now appears that the dedication to Aphrodite Urania came from the shrine of the Cyprian Aphrodite (IG II² 337, 4636). I am still inclined, with Schäfer (Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, 1880, 420 ff., cf. Hell. Athens, 219, n. 6), to explain differently the use of

θεόν, θεάς, and θεούς in the records which did come from the Metroon (cf., on the other hand, Poland, 10 ff., 216), and to recognize neither a distinctiveness of associations nor the fusion of the cult-groups of two goddesses. The former is quite out of the question; the latter must have been temporary or occasional, if it really existed. The two bodies must have met jointly and one of them separately on the same day (1329, 1328 II). The association which is thought to have united with the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods is that of the orgeones of the Syrian Aphrodite. This was not created until half a century later; see above, 119 ff. "The goddess," and "the gods" are reconcilable in view of the association of Attis with the Mother of the Gods in the cult of the Athenian orgeones — an association which is vouched for by the allusion to two θρόνοι in 1328 I and by the designation of the fête which the orgeones of 1315 celebrated as τὰ Ἀττίδεια. The feminine plural τὰς θεάς is more difficult. It may have been used, instead of the more natural masculine plural, τοὺς θεούς, to emphasize the predominance of the Mother of the Gods over her consort. It is also possible that in the cult-apparatus of the orgeones a *naiskos* with *two* images of the Mother of the Gods was used, as frequently in Attica, though no example, it seems, has turned up in the Piraeus, and that τὰς θεάς designated only one goddess (Graillot, 506, n. mentions only one double naiskos, but cf. H. Hepding, Der Attiskult, 138, n. 7; Usener, Rh. Mus. 58, 1903, 191 ff., 204); or that a second minor female divinity was associated with the Mother of the Gods in this cult, thus creating a divine pair like the Mother of the Gods and Parthenos (Persephone?) at Phistyon in Aetolia (IG IX² 1, 1. 96, Nock, Conversion, 59, 282; cf. Latte, Gnomon, IX, 1933, 409). It is, however, a fact that at Phistyon the Syrian Aphrodite "was worshipped in a temple which she appears to have shared with Ματὴρ τῶν θεῶν καὶ Παρθένος." Temple-sharing does not, however, imply a single set of rites. I should like to add, for what it is worth, that in Catullus, LXIII, 6 ff. Attis becomes feminine after emasculation.

IG II² 1316 has a feature peculiar to itself. Notwithstanding that in the text of the decree the members of the association call themselves orgeones (the word occurs four times), in the crowns carved two above and two below the text they are called thiasotai. It can be thought that the peculiarity of the inscribing in the crowns is traceable to the stone-cutter. He doubtless received the text of the decree from the treasurer and epimeletai of the orgeones. He may have received the order to inscribe on the stone in addition as many crowns as the space permitted, with identical names, it being left to him to insert within the crowns the title of the grantees. By this time associations of thiasotai had become so numerous in the Piraeus that the name thiasotai was the usual appellation of members of

private cults. The stone-cutter's business in the Piraeus must have been normally with thiasotai rather than with orgeones and this was probably the name he cut in crowns when he was not given contrary instructions. Even if the orgeones had noticed his mistake and disliked it they may easily have let it go rather than mutilate the surface of the marble by having it corrected. *Stelai* were frequently set up without revisions of the texts being made after they had been engraved (cf., for example, Hesperia, VII, no. 1 and pp. 8 f.). Some such explanation as this is preferable to the one now commonly given (Wilhelm, Oester, Jahresh. 1902, 132) — that by the middle of the third century B.C. thiasotai and orgeones were interchangeable terms — because this is the only instance known to us in which the two designations are seemingly synonymous. There is, however, an alternate explanation of this abnormality which must be taken into account. Now that the archon Lysitheides, in whose year IG II² 1316 was passed, is certainly dated in the middle of the third century B.C. (246/45, Pritchett and Meritt; 253/52, Dinsmoor, The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries), it is the earliest record of the orgeones of the Mother of the Gods in our possession. In the series of decrees which came from the hieron in Akte it falls between IG II 1273 (284/83 B.C.) and the group which belongs in the last quarter of the third century. As pointed out above (n. 49), the owners of the hieron in 284/83 B.C. were thiasotai. In 246/45? B.C. (IG II 1316), as in the last quarter of the third century and thereafter, the control of the Metroon is in the hands of the orgeones. Since two distinct associations cannot have been the owners of one shrine simultaneously we must accept one of two things, either that two shrines of the Mother of the Gods co-existed in the same area or that a change in the title and composition of the controlling association occurred between 284/83 and 246/45 B.C. For the first of these alternatives, which might have been proved or disproved if the area had been excavated scientifically, the parallel of the orgeones of Bendis (above, p. 102) might be adduced; but there we have two distinct associations simultaneously active, here the *κοινόν*, that is to say, a corporate body of thiasotai disappears completely; and the only remaining traces of thiasotai are found in the records of the orgeones. The second alternative is clearly preferable. The thiasotai must have been hard hit by the economic vicissitudes of the foreign traders and sea-merchants of the Piraeus during the critical epoch in which the association ceased to exist. Transfers of hiera from private to public control are so well attested as to be normal in Athens; but so far as I know there is no parallel to the transfer of a hieron from aliens to citizens. Yet this is what most probably occurred with the Metroon in the Piraeus between 284/83 and 246/45 B.C. At some point between these dates, perhaps not long before 246/45 B.C., a

group, undoubtedly a relatively large group, of citizens organized themselves as orgeones with an annual priestess instead of two semi-annual priests, and a civil staff, modelled perhaps on that of the orgeones of Bendis, of epimeletai, treasurer, and secretary, and acquired control of the shrine and cult of the Mother of the Gods. It may have taken into its membership the residue of the thiasotai or its élite. Assuming this to have been the genesis of the society four abnormalities in its records are explicable. 1. Ergasion becomes intelligible. In fact he may have obtained the office, not as an exception, but in consequence of an arrangement made when the orgeones took over the shrine whereby one of the three epimeletai had to be an alien. 2. The incorporation of thiasotai among the orgeones would also explain the stone-cutter's procedure in inscribing θιασῶται instead of ὀργεῶνες in the four crowns which he engraved on the stele from which IG II² 1316 is copied. The association was in fact a composite of thiasotai and orgeones. 3. The burial fund is in order. An association of orgeones, without thiasotai, did not need one. The Athenian law ([Demos.] XLIII 57 f.) placed the responsibility for the inhumation or cremation of freemen upon their heirs or kinsmen and of slaves upon their masters, and empowered the demarchs in cases of default to do the necessary and collect the costs from those responsible. The presupposition is that freemen had either property or kin. This might be true for citizens and metics; but it cannot have accorded with facts for many non-resident aliens. For these private associations with burial funds would guarantee decent obsequies (cf. above, p. 115). 4. The difficulty raised by the phrase ἀμφότερα τὰ Ἀττίδεια in IG II² 1315 disappears. Deubner (Att. Feste, 222) writes: "Entweder handelt es sich um zwei gesonderte Feste des Jahres, oder, ähnlich wie in Rom, um eine Feier, die sich über zwei Tage erstreckte, von denen beide den Namen Attideia führten" (Foucart, Assoc. rel. 92, Hepding, Attis. 137). The second suggestion is contrary to Greek practice, according to which a single name designated fêtes whether they occupied one day or several. There was only one Apaturia even though each of the three days consumed by it had so distinctive a character that it had a name of its own (Schol. Aristoph. Achar. 146; cf. Deubner, Att. Feste, 232). Two separate Attideia in a year require an explanation. A time interval between the two is demanded. We may conclude that ἀμφότερα derives from the union of the thiasotai, with one calendar, and the orgeones, with another (cf. n. 49). The priestess spread the couch for both, but the one may have been attended by the aliens and the other by the citizens. The rites of the former may have been more purely Phrygian than those of the latter. If they were identical their performance at a different time may be attributed to the desire of the aliens or of the citizens to have a fête of Attis by themselves.

THE CULT OF HEROES

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I

THE text discussed p. 73 ff. is a measure to ensure equitable and uncontentious distribution of the flesh of the two 'full-grown victims,' and presumably of the young pig also.[1] There is no mention of the burning of portions in honor of the heroines or of the hero, and outside Greece we know of sacrifices in which the worshippers took all.[2] Such detail would be irrelevant to the purpose of our inscription, which is not a *lex sacra*; and the use of θύειν and the presence of an altar (for the restoration in line 6 is almost certain) strongly suggest that conventional symbolic offerings were made by fire.

Certainly the worshippers got most of the meat. Now it is usual to draw a sharp distinction between (*a*) sacrifice to Olympians (wherein the worshippers shared the victim with the gods), and (*b*) sacrifice to gods of the underworld, commonly called chthonic, and to heroes (wherein the worshippers received no part),[3] and to think of the first as implying table

[1] For the problem of division cf. Plut. Prov. Alex. (ed. Crusius, Progr. Tüb. 1887), p. 11 f.

[2] Herodotus I 132 asserts this of Persian sacrifices (but cf. J. Rom. Stud. XXX, 1940, 194, n. 18). The Salaminioi inscription (n. 18) does not mention the giving of portions to the supernatural beings worshipped, but the purpose of that text also is to keep peace between the men concerned. In general, I suspect that in Greek practice the beings worshipped almost always received something, however little; yet cf. the texts mentioned in nn. 27 and 28 and the 'cup of Hygieia,' n. 60.

[3] E. Rohde, Psyche, I 148 ff.: Ph. E. Legrand in Daremberg-Saglio IV 970 ff.; P. Foucart, Le culte des héros (Mém. Acad. inscr. XLII, 1918) 96; Ch. Picard, Bull. Corr. Hell. XLVII (1923), 255 etc. Exceptions have often been noted, e.g. by Deneken in Roscher's Lex. I 2505 f.; A. S. F. Gow, J. Hell. Stud. XXXII (1912), 217, 238 n. 142. — The term 'chthonic' should be used with caution after the criticisms of A. Fairbanks, Am. J. Phil. XXI, 1900, 241 ff.; A. Thomsen, Arch. Rel. XII (1909), 481 ff.; M. P. Nilsson in Gercke-Norden, Einleitung, II iv (ed. 4), 65; cf. p. 160, later. Not all that is laid in the ground is buried; vegetation comes from the ground and even from the dead (E. Gjerstad, Arch. Rel. XXVI, 1928, 183 ff.). As Nilsson observed, Arch. Rel. XXXII, 1935, 113, 'Der Pithos

fellowship and the second as showing the avoidance of anything of the sort. A brief reconsideration of the question may be of service.

We shall now review first some of the evidence for this distinction and for the ideas associated with it, secondly a list of exceptions; in Part II we shall ask how far table fellowship was implicit in participation in sacrifice; in Part III we shall consider what was involved in non-participation; in Part IV we shall survey some of the meanings of the term *heros*.

Herodotus II 44 praises those of the Greeks who have two temples (or cults) of Heracles, one for him as immortal and with the epithet Olympios, the other for him as hero.[4] Antiquarians and grammarians went too far in schematic analysis of divergences in detail, but the distinction in general had a solid basis and corresponded to differences in status and myth between gods and heroes. The heroes of a given city were jointly invoked,[5] heroes as Homeric characters made an interrelated group, and certain heroes were thought to have gone to the Islands of the Blessed; but the category of heroes in general represents no more than an aggregate of individuals each having his story, habitat, or function,[6] and neither, like

war zugleich Grab und Kornspeicher.' [On *chthonioi*, cf. also Wilamowitz, Glaube, I 210 f.] The opposite category of Olympioi is perhaps somewhat clearer (cf. H. Herter, Pauly-Wissowa, XVIII 21), and the classification as such must have influenced the views taken of deities; yet after all Hecate was identified with Artemis.

[4] Cf. Pind Nem. 3. 22 ἥρως θεός (hero who is a god, like ἀνθρωποδαίμων); H. Seyrig, Bull. Corr. Hell. LI (1927) 185 ff., 197, on the cult at Thasos, with inferences strikingly confirmed by a subsequent inscriptional find (M. Launey, ibid. LXI, 1937, 380 ff., R. Flacelière — J. Robert — L. Robert, Rev. ét. gr. LII, 1939, 491 f. Launey suggests, p. 400, that what looks like a *bothros* may belong to the heroic cult. This is possible but not necessary; cf. M. P. Nilsson in Studier tillägnade O. Rydbeck, 44 n. 1); S. Eitrem, Symb. Oslo. VIII (1929), 36.

[5] Cf. J. Ziehen, Leges Graecorum Sacrae, 104 ff. no. 35 (IG II^2 1195) for sacrifice by the members of a deme καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσιν [καὶ ταῖς ἡρωίναις?]; Aristoph. Av. 881 (to which Professor Bonner calls attention; it comes in a very comprehensive list); Plut. Q. R. 25 p. 270 A for the second of the month as sacred to heroes and daimones (with H. J. Rose's note p. 179; we do not know where the custom was observed: cf. p. 164 below for an artificial principle of this kind); Supp. epigr. gr. IX 334, 336 ff. (Cyrene) for ἡρώων, apparently as underworld powers. The heroes naturally form a category in Philostr. Her. e.g. pr. 2.

[6] As Wilamowitz said in Neue Jahrb. XXIX (1912) 472, 'der Heros ist in jedem einzelnen Falle eine bestimmte Person.'

the Olympians, constituting a divine society, nor, like the Christian saints, attaching themselves to it. For some heroes there was annual lamentation;[7] and heroic cult in the special sense was, as Pfister has said, 'gesteigerter Totenkult.'[8] A dead man might be thought to have *become* a god: no one *became* a hero, except in the sense of being recognized as such.

Further, certain *leges sacrae* show that sanctuaries of heroes and offerings made to them sometimes entailed such measure of ceremonial uncleanness as clung to ordinary death.

An inscription of Cos (in its present form, of the first half of the third century B.C.) ordains that the priestess of Demeter Olympia is not to have contact with anything impure, nor to eat by the tomb of a hero nor to set her foot on a *heroon*, just as she is not to enter a house in which there is childbirth, and prescribes the purification necessary if she does otherwise; the priestess of another Demeter cult on Cos was forbidden to set foot on a *heroon*.[9] At Cyrene, any burial-places other than those of Battos and the Tritopatores and Onymastos convey uncleanness.[10] Apollo's oracle, quoted as the source of the regulations, thought it necessary to state exceptions to the general rule. Pausanias V 13. 2 f. describes the sacrifice at Olympia of a black ram into a pit in honor of Pelops and the custom of giving the victim's neck to the so-called 'woodman,' and adds, 'Whoever — native Elean or stranger — eats of the flesh of the victim offered to Pelops, may not enter the temple of Zeus.[11] At Pergamon, on the river Caicus, the same thing happens to persons who sacrifice to Telephus: they may not go up to the sanctuary of Asclepius till they have bathed.' The Thasian ordinance for sacrifices to the heroic Heracles shows an earnest desire that people should avoid mistakes on this as on other points.[12]

We have here a matter of well established practice, familiar to intelligent Greeks. Yet there is a substantial body of exceptions, partial and total. By partial exceptions, I mean those in which a figure frequently regarded as a hero was spoken

[7] Nilsson, Neue Jahrb. XXVII (1911), 631 ff.: cf. Eugen Reiner, Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen (Tüb. Beitr. Altertumswissenschaft, XXX, 1938), with J. L. Heller's review, Class Weekly XXXIII (1940), 260 f.

[8] Die Religion d. Griechen u. Römer (Burs. Jahresb. 229, 1930), 155.

[9] R. Herzog, Arch. Rel. X (1907), 400 ff., and Heïlige Gesetze (Abh. Berlin, 1928, vi), 20 ff.

[10] Supp. epigr. gr. IX 72, l. 21 ff.

[11] The 'woodman' perhaps incurred no taboo; cf. V 15. 10 for his part in the monthly sacrifices.

[12] H. Seyrig, cited n. 4; cf. l. 26 of the Cyrene text and the Pythagorean ordinance quoted p. 163 below, as further evidence that the public at large was not always meticulous.

of as a god and received the sacrifice appropriate to a god, e.g. Heracles, Melampus,[13] Amphiaraus, the Dioscuri, Hyacinthus, Trophonius,[14] etc. Sometimes the wheel is come full circle; a faded deity has been regarded as a dead hero, and yet has received divine cultus. Even such instances are relevant, since these characters had heroic legends and Amphiaraus [15] and Trophonius are attached to particular spots and belong to the underworld. Sophocles, Electra 841 describes Amphiaraus as ruling beneath the earth in full vitality. Accordingly, whatever the terminology and whatever the nominal status of these supernatural beings, their cultus in divine forms is an explicit contradiction of any hard and fast line between celestial and 'chthonic,' always divine and once human.[16]

There are numerous total exceptions, as follows:

(1) Our text, in which Echelos is 'the hero,' and the heroines are described by that title.

(2) The cults of Egretes (pp. 80 f.), and probably Hypodektes (pp. 81 f.); it may fairly be assumed that orgeones in general partook of sacrifices. *Hestiator* as the title of the chief official is conclusive.

(3) The Attic Theseia, at least as amplified in the fifth century. The skins of the numerous animals sacrificed were sold, which excludes the idea of holocaust; and the banquet given to the people appears to have utilized their flesh. Nevertheless, Theseus was hero, not god: much importance was attached to his relics, and apparently *choai*, funerary libations, were made.[17] This exception is very significant, since the conservative Cimon took the lead in bringing up the relics of Theseus from Skyros to Athens, and presumably

[13] IG VII 219, where θ[εοῦ] seems certain; if the art type of a child suckled by a goat refers to him (cf. Pley, Pauly-Wissowa XV 393), he may be a faded pre-Greek deity. Asclepius, in spite of the legend, is treated as fully divine: cf. the Pergamene ordinance just noted.

[14] Note Pausan. IX 39.5 (those waiting for revelations fed lavishly on the victims offered to Trophonius, his children, and certain deities).

[15] In spite of the story of his ascent as a god (Pausan. I 34. 4).

[16] After all, many heroes had a place in the precinct of the deity. Again, as early as the time of Philochorus, an object in the inmost part of the Delphic sanctuary and next to the golden image of Apollo was regarded as the tomb of Dionysus and the tale was not thought incongruous (the supposed inscription as cited in Malalas II 52 p. 45, cannot be ascribed to Philochorus and hardly, I think, even to Kephalion; cf. Fr. Jacoby, Frag. gr. Hist. II C, p. 298. It is a copy of the familiar 'epitaph of Zeus').

[17] Cf. L. Deubner, Attische Feste, 224 f.; H. Herter, Rh. Mus. LXXXVIII (1939), 292 ff. For the Athenians, Theseus was a human hero, even if he was perhaps originally more than man; cf. L. Radermacher, Mythos u. Sage bei d. Griechen, 262 ff.

in the establishment of the festival, and this at a time when the Areopagus still had its power.

(4) The ceremonial of the Salaminioi, who in their 'offerings to gods and heroes' gave to Ioleos a sheep burnt whole; the absence of the term holokauton shows that they shared the victims sacrificed to Eurysaces, 'the heros at the Hale,' and apparently those sacrificed to the hero Phaiax, the hero Teukros, the hero Nauseiros, and Skiros.[18]

(5) The offerings of the Marathonian tetrapolis to various unspecified heroines, and *heros Pheraios*, etc.[19]

(6) Offerings to another heroine, mentioned in an Athenian inscription.[20]

(7) The regular distribution of 'portions' after sacrifices to Paralos, whose status as an Attic hero is not explicit in the ordinance but is in literary texts.[21]

(8) The Phocian custom of bringing victims daily to a hero-founder at Tronis, pouring the blood through a hole into his grave and consuming the flesh on the spot (Paus. X 4. 10; cf. n. 63).

(9) The practice at Phigalea, recorded in an account of the communal meals of the city; 'and whenever they sacrifice to the heroes, there is a great

[18] W. S. Ferguson, Hesperia, VII (1938), 1 ff.

[19] J. v. Prott, Fasti sacri, 48 f. (= IG II^2 1358. The distribution of portions is not mentioned but *ἱερώσυνα* are: and where priests receive their perquisites, even though as here in the form of a commutation in cash, it is to be presumed that the offering was not burnt whole: contrast *οὐδὲ γέρα τέμνεται* at Thasos; Ch. Picard, Bull. Corr. Hell. XLVII, 1923, 241 ff. and n. 4 above. The woodman at Olympia received a portion but the mantis did not).

[20] J. Ziehen, Leges 78 ff. no. 24 (= IG II^2 1356; *ἱερε]ώσυνα* and skins mentioned).

[21] Ch. Michel, Rec. inscr. gr. suppl. 1517. We should perhaps add the Eleusinian heroes listed in the portion of the restored Solonian code published by J. H. Oliver, Hesperia IV (1935), 21, ll. 65 ff. There is not here as with other cults in the list a mention of *ἱερεώσυνα*, but these heroes are coupled with deities as receiving sacrifice from the Eumolpidai: [*θύουσιν*] may be regarded as certain; and, though we should not press the word, it is applied to both categories without distinction.

Triptolemus, though in popular legend an heroic figure, had a share in divine cultus. I am inclined to regard him as from the beginning a subordinate deity humanized by mythology; cf. Strabo X p. 468 for the notion of *πρόπολοι*, supernatural and human. Such figures are commonly plural, Silenoi, Satyroi, Okeanides, and occasionally Panes, and their individual naming would in general be secondary. Are the figures named in Oliver's text and Hom. H. Dem. 153 ff. just such a group? (Cf. P. Mazon, Mél. Bidez, 607 f. on Ploutoi; the *Incubo* of Petron. 38. 8 should perhaps be compared.) Minoan-Mycenaean art objects represent various daemonic cult attendants (e.g. Nilsson, Minoan-Mycenaean Religion, 327, etc.). These are often shown as part-animal; but such could be humanized (cf. also *δαιμόνων ἀγώμενος* in the 'hymn of the Curetes'; Diehl, Anthologia lyrica, II 279 ff.).

Subordination is sometimes the result of the superimposition of one cult on another (e.g. of that of Apollo on that of Hyakinthos), but need not always be; cf. n. 73 below. (It must of course be remembered that, as Wilamowitz and Nilsson have taught us, the word *daimon* is extremely rare in cult. It is a word of reflection and analysis.)

offering of oxen, and all of the Phigaleans feast together with their slaves; sons sit on stones, without outer garments, and dine . . at the banquets.' [22]

(10) The custom at Tarentum of offering heroic sacrifice (*enagizein*) to the Atreidai and Tydeidai and Aiakidai and Laertiadai, and also on one special day a *thysia* to the Agamemnonidai, of which women did not partake — and therefore presumably men did.[23]

(11) A *lex sacra* at Mykonos (ca. 200 B.C.) recording a sacrifice to an Archegetes (probably heroic), of which people partook.[24]

With the possible exception of the Tarentine practice, these are old rituals. We should recall also three new foundations.[25]

(1) Epicteta's foundation at Thera (210–195 B.C.) provides for sacrifice to the Muses and the heroes (two dead sons, her dead husband, and herself); certain offerings, including fish, are reserved to the heroes, but of others they, like the Muses, receive only the portions due to them; the rest is available for human consumption, a fact the more striking since the division of the victim for each pair of heroes exists side by side with the strictly funerary offering of fish.[26]

[22] Harmodius of Lepreon ap. Athenae. IV p. 149 C. The heroes in question have been thought to be the soldiers from Oresthasion, buried in the marketplace (so Ernst Meyer in Pauly-Wissowa XIX 2084); we may follow Nilsson, Griech. Feste, 455 n. 2 in leaving the question open. May the festival have been one for all the heroes of the city? Certainly there is no mention of a grave or *bothros*. (The fact that the sons sat to eat does not indicate anything funerary: children usually sat at meals, while their elders reclined; cf. Th. Klauser, Die Cathedra im Totenkult, 5 n. 16; 21.)

[23] [Arist.] mir. ausc. 106, p. 840a. Cf. G. Giannelli, Culti e miti della Magna Grecia, 42 f.

[24] Dittenberger, ed. 3, 1024, 39 ff. We should probably add J. von Prott, Fasti sacri 36 no. 15. 11 (= Collitz-Bechtel, Sammlung 4650, IG V i 1447), if Κλαικοφόρωι is there as at Epidaurus the name of a hero; but Meister (cf. M. N. Tod, J. Hell. St. XXXII, 1912, 103) regards the word as the title of a religious functionary. Another possible instance is afforded by Dieuchidas ap. Athenae. VI p. 263 A. Phorbas ordered his friends to have free men perform his *enagismoi* 'and the custom continues in the sacrifice (*θυσίᾳ*) of Phorbas. The attendants are free men and a slave may not come near.' *θυσίᾳ* is not to be pressed, but *οἱ διακονοῦντες*, 'the attendants,' above all in the context in Athenaeus, strongly suggests a cult-meal (cf. Plut. Q. G. 44 p. 301 E). Whatever Phorbas was in origin (cf. n. 73) he was deemed to have been a man; cf. Diod. Sic. V 58, where we read *ἔσχε τιμὰς ἡρωϊκὰς*.

[25] We might be tempted to include Philopoemen: cf. Dittenberger, ed. 3, 624 (the restoration in line 37 *τὰ δὲ κρέα τ[ὰ] βρώσ[ιμα] κ[ατακαίειν]* can hardly be right, since the skins were not burnt, as in holocaust; perhaps *κ[ατακόπτειν]*) and Foucart 142 ff. His bones were brought back with due solemnity. Yet his honors are described as equal to divine, *τιμαῖς ἰσοθέοις*, noteworthy as an official use of the phrase, and the foundation was made at a time when the cultus of rulers as gods was familiar.

[26] IG XII iii 330 (= B. Laum, Stiftungen, II 49 no. 43), esp. ll. 178 ff.; F. J.

(2) A slightly later foundation on Amorgos (within the second century B.C.) provides for the slaying of a ram beside the cult image of the heroized Aleximachos; its flesh and half the offerings of wheat are to form prizes in a contest, the other half going to officials.[27]

(3) Though the situation is not identical, we may note that priest, worshippers, and wives shared the victims offered to the Tyche Agathe of the father and mother of Poseidonios, to the Daimon Agathos of Poseidonios and Gorgis, and to various deities.[28]

These later institutions are pertinent, for our evidence from Cos and Cyrene (p. 143, above) shows that the taboos were not dead.

This is further illustrated by Plutarch, Arat. 53. The Sicyonians secured from the Achaeans the body of Aratus, 'but since they had an ancient ordinance that no one might be buried within the city walls, and a strong religious scruple (*δεισιδαιμονία*) attached to the ordinance, they sent to Delphi to consult the Pythia on these matters.' The Pythia approved and they turned their mourning into joy, and with garlands, white robes and paeans (cf. n. 78) and dances brought the body into the city, and established a shrine for Aratus as founder and savior. This story indicates the strength as well as the variability of Greek scruples, powerful here in spite of an eager popular desire to pay perpetual honor to the remains of a beloved servant of the city. (It should be remarked that Sicyon had a double cult of Heracles, as god and as hero: Pausan. II 10. 1 and p. 142 above.)

To resume, there is a formidable body of instances, early and late, in which departure from the norm of heroic cultus is attested and we cannot dispose of them by supposing that all the heroes in question were formally honored as gods, not as heroes, for the texts prove the opposite. Nor can we maintain Foucart's view that exceptions are due to a fading of distinctions:[29] the text from which we started goes back to the middle

---

Dölger, IXΘΤΣ, II 377 ff. — E. Dyggve-Fr. Poulsen — K. Rhomaios, Das Heroon v. Kalydon (Mém. Acad. Copenhagen, VII sér. 4, iv, 1934) publish the remains of the structure of what might have been a comparable foundation not later than about 100 B.C. The finds give no detail as to the cult, but the excavators identify as 'Speisesaal, für Mahlzeiten und Symposia kultischer Art bestimmt' (107 [395]) a room next to the larger one with an apse in which was found a 'cult-table.' The interment was under the apse and inaccessible (100 [388]; cf. Fr. Matz, Die Antike, IV, 1928, 270, 276).

[27] IG XII vii 515 (Laum II 57 ff. no. 50), ll. 74 ff. Nothing is said as to the disposal of the goat sacrificed according to ll. 103 ff.

[28] Dittenberger, ed. 3, 1044 (Laum II 111 f., no. 117). Cf. Laum II 38, no. 31, making provision for sacrifice at the tomb and a public banquet of a commemorative kind, but not calling the dead man a hero (the text is incomplete).

[29] Le culte des héros, 106.

of the fifth century (p. 76 above), and the practice must be older, while various of the other rituals listed are clearly ancient. Heroic cults created from the latter part of the sixth century onwards might be expected to follow an accepted classical norm; until we come to private foundations of the Hellenistic period, divergences are likely to be survivals rather than innovations.

Ada Thomsen has shown that there is no simple formula for these matters.[30] When the sacrifice is a holocaust, the victims dark, not light, and the time night rather than day, then the cult in question is usually directed to heroes or to deities of the earth or underworld, but we cannot make even this proposition universal (cf. p. 159 later). Certainly we cannot reverse it, and say that, where such rites were *not* employed, the objects of cult were gods or goddesses of the Olympian type. Nor, again, can we safely forget Thomsen's reminder that the high point of Greek popular religion is the joyous festival, and that the Greeks were not dominated by any fear of ghosts.[31]

II

'Ye shall eat before the Lord your God and ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hand unto.'

We come now to the general question of table fellowship, and to two particular propositions. First, participation in the flesh of a sacrificed victim did not involve conscious table fellowship with the supernatural recipient of other parts of the animal, and, although a god was now guest, now host, man kept his distance. Second (pp. 156 ff.), the semblance of table fellowship with heroes and with the dead was not avoided.

(1) It is now widely held that, when part of a victim went to the gods and part to the worshippers, this division once involved a communion between the two in the flesh of the victim

[30] Arch. XII 481 ff. Julian Ep. 89 p. 142. 14 ff. Bidez-Cumont (= p. 170. 3 ff. Bidez), 98 p. 158. 11 ff. Bidez-Cumont (= p. 182. 13 ff. Bidez) does not appear to find any essential difference between sacrifice by day and sacrifice by night.

[31] Nor were they free of it; cf. Nilsson, Greek Popular Religion, 102 ff. for a corrective against any ascription to them of a thoroughgoing rationalism.

and created a bond of table fellowship. This hypothesis can be made to explain much that would otherwise be obscure. Nevertheless, we must not impute to the ancients anything like a conscious awareness of the idea, still less any inferences which it may suggest to us, e.g. 'the apprehension lest by entering into communion with the shadowy world one should be brought under its power.' [32] To the Greeks, laymen and theorists alike, sacrifice was primarily a matter of gift or first fruits or tribute and of effective action by the offering of these: 'gifts persuade the gods, gifts persuade revered kings.' Even if the god's part of the victim was small, the giving of it recognized his superior prerogative, just as the payment of a nominal or 'peppercorn' rent acknowledges ownership of land; the god received *time*, honor (Porph. Abst. II 20). So, after first fruits had been offered, it was legitimate to consume the remainder of a crop. The same principle is seen in the cup of the Agathos Daimon at the end of dinner and the cups of Zeus Olympios (or Zeus Olympios and the Olympian gods), the heroes and Zeus Soter in a symposium (n. 60). The god received only a libation and the rest was consumed by the guests. Nevertheless the cups were called those of these supernatural beings and were hallowed by their names, not shared with them.

Philosophers who speak of the fellowship, *koinonia*, between gods and men [33] do not draw any inference from the fact that the flesh of victims was divided between them. This is not specially noteworthy, for we should not expect Stoics to draw an inference from ritual. It is, however, significant that Iamblichus and Sallustius, in their attempts to show how

[32] L. R. Farnell, Greek Hero Cults, 354: in fairness I should quote the words which immediately precede 'whether through fear of the wrath of the ghost or through.' E. Rohde remarks, Psyche I 242 n., on the abstention of initiates at Eleusis from certain foods, 'Wer von der Speise der Unterirdischen geniesst, ist ihnen verfallen': but, after all, the initiates were deliberately brought into a specific relation to Demeter and were given reason to fear the underworld less, not more. Persephone and the pomegranate seeds (Hom. H. Dem. 373) are not relevant. Cf. Iambl. V. Pyth. 109 on the avoidance of what belongs to chthonic deities; but the same tradition forbade participation in what belongs to the gods; cf. p. 164 later.

[33] Cf. Hauck in G. Kittel, Theol. Wörterb. N. T., III 800. One incidental comment may be noted: Menander ap. Porph. Abst. II 17 speaks of incense and cakes as pious, *εὐσεβής*, since the god takes all of them.

sacrifice creates a bond between gods and men and to give it a meaning while denying that the gods had need of anything,[34] do not make use of this fact.

There are certain apparent exceptions to what has been said. First, Dion of Prusa III 97 asks 'What sacrifice is acceptable to the gods without men who feast with them?'[35]: the question reflects the idea of divine *philanthropia* and the notion of the deity as host rather than the division of the flesh of the victim into a 'divine part' for the gods and other portions for the worshippers. Secondly, Aristides says in his prose hymn To Sarapis (26–8):

> Among gods he is at one and the same time the greatest lover of humanity and the most terrifying. . . . But he is the more inclined to mercy. What Homer said of all the gods, that they may be turned and appeased, is confirmed most strikingly by Sarapis: so many turns does he turn for the well-being of those who at any time need him. Wherefore men have the true partnership in sacrifices with this god alone above all others: they invite him to their hearths and set him in the chair as guest and entertainer (*hestiator*): so that where some make up one party and some another, Sarapis alone makes up all parties and is lord of the feast for those who at any time come together under his auspices. . . . He is at the same time participant in libations (ὁμόσπονδος, usually of men) and the receiver of libations. . . . There is a similar partnership — as of equals in honor with an equal in honor, — of men with him in other matters: so merchants and sea captains do not just give him tithes, but they share with him equally as a fellow merchant and partner in all their undertakings.

Before commenting on this, we may note also Philo's expression of the Jewish sentiment of intimacy with God in terms reminiscent of Greek humanism, when he writes of the sacri-

[34] De mysteriis V 5 ff., p. 205 ff. Parthey: Concerning the gods and the universe, 16. Cf. Appendix 1.

[35] ποία δὲ θυσία κεχαρισμένη θεοῖς ἄνευ τῶν συνευωχουμένων; I doubt whether J. v. Arnim, Leben u. Werke d. Dio v. Prusa, 428 f. and Wilamowitz (Hermes LXIII, 1928, 381) are right in bracketing θεοῖς. Certainly the latter goes too far in finding the utterance blasphemous; it is of a piece with many Greek utterances (cf. Nock, Proc. Am. Philos. Soc. LXXXV, 1942, 477 f. etc.), and in the same section of Dio we have (107) ὃ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς χαλεπόν. — συνευωχοῦ αὐτῷ ἐπᾴδων αὐτῷ, addressed to a man who is to make a magical figure (K. Preisendanz, Pap. gr. mag. IV 3150 f. vol. i, p. 174) is naturally quite different; it is a proceeding to secure magical power; for the intimacy desired, cf. ibid. I 37 ff. p. 4.

ficial ordinances in Leviticus 19. 5–6 (Spec. leg. I 221): 'The meals are now the property not of him by whom but of him to whom the victim has been sacrificed, the benefactor, the bountiful one, who has made the festive company of those who perform the sacrifice partners of the altar and sharers of the table.' [36] (As so often in Philonic applications of Greek ideas, the purpose is homiletical.)

The whole context in Aristides is important as showing how he envisaged partnership, *koinonia*. The specific reference is to the widespread habit of having meals of fellowship called 'couch of Sarapis,' [37] but, as A. Höfler saw,[38] Aristides is thinking not only of these but of all meals in which worshippers of Sarapis had him in mind. Some symbolic offering or act of homage was probably made before a representation of the god. Yet we should not press too hard the word 'sacrifices,' for as early as Herodotus VIII 99 it had come very near to meaning 'dinner party.'

Thirdly, we have a passage of Porphyry de Philosophia ex oraculis haurienda preserved in Euseb. Praep. evang. IV 9. 7 p. 147 c. Porphyry has quoted a late 'theological oracle' which defines modes of sacrifice and says of victims offered to the starry and ethereal gods, 'Give the extremities to Hephaistos (i.e., burn them), and eat the rest.' He comments: *οὐρανίοις δὲ καὶ αἰθερίοις τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν ζῴων κουφότερα, ἅπερ ἐστὶν ἄκρα, οἷς κοινωνεῖν τῆς θυσίας δεῖ. δοτῆρες γὰρ οὗτοι ἀγαθῶν, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι τῶν κακῶν κωλυτῆρες.* For *οἷς κ. τ. θ. δ.* our oldest codex, A, copied for Arethas, reads *οἷς κοινωνεῖν τῆς οὐσίας*. This can be interpreted as 'and the gods are of like nature with these extremities' since *ἄκρα* means that which is high as well as that which is at the end of something. Such a remark would fit Porphyry's application of the principle, 'like rejoices in like,' and Séguier de Saint-Brisson, retaining *δεῖ*, so translates. Nevertheless, the words which follow, 'for these gods are givers of blessings whereas the others are averters of evils' do not agree, and, if A's reading is correct, we shall have to postulate a lacuna — which is in any event possible.

[36] Spec. leg. I 131, 196, 242 give different rationalizations.

[37] To Höfler's references add P. Roussel, Bull. Corr. Hell. LI (1927) 133; Seyrig, ibid. 222; Roussel, Cultes égyptiens à Delos, 98, 140, 285; P. Perdrizet, Terres cuites . . . Fouquet, I, 119 ff., 123; S. Eitrem, P. Oslo., III p. 246 f.; also the Syrian parallels discussed by H. Seyrig, Syria, XIV (1933) 260 ff. and XVIII (1937) 372 ff. (l. 10 *εἰς κρεανομίαν πάντων τῶν ἐστιωμένων τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἔμπροσθεν Μαννου θεοῦ*. — For the god as presiding at a human meal after sacrifice cf. Athenae. X p. 420 E–F.

[38] Der Sarapishymnus des Ailios Aristeides, 94. Cf. Diodorus of Sinope ap. Athenae. VI p. 239 B on Zeus Philios as taking his share at any well ordered meal.

On the whole, οἷς κοινωνεῖν τῆς θυσίας δεῖ is likelier (Wolff's οὓς is certainly to be rejected). We must translate, as Gifford, 'and with these gods we must participate in the sacrifice' — which corresponds to τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάσασθαι of the oracle.

This is the nearest thing to an exception that I have found: joint participation between gods and men, declared to be of the essence of a rite. Yet the rationale is to be noted: we must share *because* these gods are givers of good things. We receive a gift from supernatural beings whose nature it is to give; our share of sacrifice is like 'all the blessings of this life.' With such deities we must share: I do not press the point, but the verb is δεῖ, not πρέπει 'it is fitting,' or προσήκει 'it is a duty' (cf. the contrast in Porph. Abst. II 2 where δεῖ occurs by itself two other times to mean 'is inevitable'). The function of these deities is positive, while that of the deities with whom we do not share is negative. This is not a distinction between chancy and unchancy table companions. (For what looks like an exception in Julian, cf. Appendix 1.)

Here as elsewhere the god is primarily host: so were Apollo to the other gods at the Delphic Theoxenia, Heracles and other deities to their *parasitoi*[39] (specific groups meeting on stated occasions for sacrifice and eating as a sacred duty and in fact a civic obligation), Heracles to his *synetheis* in Macedonia,[40] Zeus at Astakos to his *synestai*[41] (whether a gild or, as I suspect, an official group comparable with the *parasitoi*), 'the god Asclepius' to his *symposiastai* at a place in Bulgaria,[42] a region in which he had a great standing, Artemis at Scillus, in the cult established by Xenophon (Anab. V 3. 9), and the Zeus of Panamara to all comers.[43]

A god could be host or guest. He is guest in various rituals

[39] On *parasitoi* cf. Athenae. VI p. 234 C ff., 239 D; Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 98 n. 1; S. Eitrem, Symb. Oslo. X (1932), 38; R. Schlaifer, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. LIV (1943). — The Spartan Tainariastai (Ziehen in Pauly-Wissowa, III A, 1504 f.) were probably somewhat similar.

[40] F. Poland in Pauly-Wissowa IV A 1366. Heracles liked company (Eurip. Alc. 795).

[41] K. Rhomaios, Arch. Delt. IV (1918), 117; Supp. ep. gr. I 213: cf. Latte in Pauly-Wissowa XIV 395. 28 ff., and J. de Keitz, De Aetolorum et Acarnanum sacris (Diss. Halle 1911), 88 ff.

[42] E. Kalinka, Ant. Denkm. in Bulgarien, 157 no. 176; E. Norden, Alt-Germanien, 298, n. 3. A Thracian at Philippi bequeathed money for observances in his memory συνποσίῳ Θεοῦ Σουρεγέθου (P. Lemerle, Bull. Corr. Hell. LX, 1936, 336 ff. Σ. is a form of the rider-god; cf. my remarks Am. J. Arch. 1943, p. 494).

[43] J. Hatzfeld, Bull. Corr. Hell. LI (1927), 73 (= Suppl. epigr. IV 247), P. Roussel, ibid. 131 ff., A. Laumonier, ibid. LXI (1937), 241; for the 'joy' of the participants (Hatzfeld 73; Roussel 134 f.), cf. Deuteronomy 12. 7, 12, 18.

of Theoxenia and Theodaisia, as again in ordinary sacrifices to which he was invited; [44] the dead also were invited to meals.[45] The Theoxenia at Delphi is expressly called *thysia*,[46] which of course connotes 'festival' as well as 'sacrifice,' and in Homer a sacrifice is called a 'meal of the gods' (Odyss. III 336: cf. Dorieus ap. Athenae. X p. 412 F ἐν Διὸς εἰλαπίναις), and the gods could be seen dining with the Phaeacians (Odyss. VII 201–203).

The Delphic Theoxenia was accompanied by a meal for worshippers (nn. 50, 52). So at Rome the *epulum Iouis* was accompanied by a feast for the senators on the Capitol, i.e. in the presence of the triad of deities. Aulus Gellius XII 8. 3, in describing the reconciliation at one such banquet of two great Romans who had quarreled, says *tum quasi diis inmortalibus arbitris in conuiuio Iouis optimi maximi dexteras eorum conducentibus.*[47] This is a fine imaginative touch and even more, for Ovid's account of offerings to Pales (Fasti IV 743 ff.) clearly implies something like a divine presence at the meal, though the explicit purpose is (777) *his dea placanda est* (cf. ibid. VI 305–308; the annual domestic rite of Iuppiter Dapalis shows the same spirit). The Romans had a deep feeling for the *sacra mensae* (Tac. Ann. XIII 17), perhaps even more than the Greeks; [48] the distribution of the victim's flesh at the Feriae

[44] Cf. Athenae. IX, p. 363 f.; Fr. Pfister in Pauly-Wissowa, V A 1711, 2256: F. Deneken, De theoxeniis; Nilsson, Gr. Feste, 442 n. 1 (Nymphs).

[45] Cf. L. Malten, Röm. Mitt. XXXVIII/IX (1923–24), 301.

[46] So Pindar Pae. VI 62, and the Delphic paean (W. Vollgraff, Bull. XLVIII, 1924, 106; XLIX, 1925, 120; cf. LI, 1927, 436 f., for note on θυσία=ἑορτή) cf. pp. 154 f. later.

[47] Cf. Liv. V 13. 7 f. on the goodwill attending private celebrations associated with a public *lectisternium*; Dion. Halic. Ant. Rom. XII 9.

In Liv. II 37. 9 the Volscians when excluded from *ludi* at Rome complain *se ut conscleratos contaminatosque ab ludis, festis diebus, coetu quodam modo hominum deorumque abactos esse.* This is a natural rhetorical combination, cf. *ius fasque.*

[48] Yet the Greeks had a high regard for the taking of salt as a bond between man and man: cf. F. J. Dölger, Antike u. Christentum, V (1936), 56 f. The astrologer Maximus (l. 324 f. p. 27 Ludwich) actually speaks of the runaway slave as forgetting the household table.

Cf. again Xen. Anab. III 2. 4, and Euphorion in D. L. Page, Greek Literary Papyri I 496 l. 26 ἤτοι ξείνια δόρπα Διός τ' ἀλίτωσι τράπεζαν (with K. Latte's comment Philol. XC, 1935, 148, 'Mahl des Fremden und Tisch des Zeus bedeuten das gleiche, da der ξένος unter der Obhut des Zeus steht'; cf. Amm. Marc. XXX 1. 22. For 'table of Zeus,' cf. p. 151, 'couch of Sarapis,' 'meal of the gods,' etc.).

Latinae was a solemn bond of union, at least blessed by Iuppiter, and the eating of part of the offerings to Terminus (Fasti II 657–658) was a sacrament of neighborliness. Yet the Romans, as far back in history as our knowledge goes, were marked by a strong legal instinct to define the purpose of action. It is therefore the more significant that the formulas which they employed in sacrifice[49] express the desire that the god may be magnified or placated or that the sacrifice may be deemed well done or (Liv. XLI 16. 1) that the god may give a blessing, but have never a word on this establishment of table fellowship. (Cf. Appendix 2.)

Participation was between the men concerned, as in *confarreatio*, which made a bond that was hallowed by deep religious sentiment and sanction. The relation of those who met to do sacrifice was to one another and not to the gods — in fact, a personal relationship, other than one of dependence and gratitude, to a *numen*, is barely thinkable.

The Greeks were much more given to anthropomorphism, but with them also the situation is that men ate of the god's table as a privilege, or had meals associated with the god's meal,[50] or again enjoyed what might be called a secondary vicarious consumption of food set before the god. (So priests and others ate food which had been set on tables before deities,[51]

[49] So of the meal to Iuppiter Dapalis, *macte hac illace dape pollucenda esto . . macte istace dape pollucenda esto, macte uino inferio esto;* and in other rites, *macte suouetaurilibus inmolandis esto. te hisce suouetaurilibus piaculo, te hoc porco piaculo, tibi hoc boue mare pulchro sacrum fiat,* etc.: G. Appel, De Romanorum precationibus (Relg. Vers. Vorarb. VII ii) 28 f., 10; O. Skutsch-H. J. Rose, Cl. Quart. XXXVI (1942) 15 ff.

[50] Cf. W. Vollgraff, Bull. XLIX (1925), 121 n. 2 for the banquet linked to the Delphic Theoxenia (a text of about 350 B.C. or a little later, published by P. Amandry in Bull. LXIII, 1939, ii and known to me through the courtesy of Professor Nilsson, specifies that the men of Skiathos are to receive portions at the Theoxenia): and perhaps Deneken, De theoxeniis, 20 ff. and F. Chapouthier, Les Dioscures au service d'une déesse, 41 ff., 132 ff. — IG XII v 129 is instructive, for it shows that in Paros a public banquet was an addition to the Theoxenia, provided by the liberality of the polemarch as priest of the Dioscuri.

In Julian's Convivium p. 308 D the Caesars have a second symposion, distinct though not out of sight of the gods.

[51] Cf. Fr. Puttkammer, Quo modo Graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint (Diss. Königsberg, 1912), Ep. Ieremiae 27 (28). This priestly participation sometimes had a special sense, e.g. in some Jewish sacrifices (A. Bertholet, J. Bibl.

just as the Jewish priests were allowed to consume the shew-bread. Again, Pindar's descendants enjoyed the poet's share at the Delphic Theoxenia and members of the Iobacchi were given the portions of the deities whose names they bore in the ceremonies.)[52] Men kept their place, just as in the Pickwick Papers 'Mr. Weller, seated at a respectful distance, though at the same table with his master, was accommodated with a pint of porter,' a concession which did not alter his status. (A Latin counterpart may be found in Columella XI 1. 19.) Unlike Mr. Pickwick, the Greek gods formed a constant background and, we may say, consecration of conviviality (Athenae. 192 B): their blessing rested on wine and food, as on the *pain bénit* of the Asklepieion of Cos.[53] No doubt there was at times some feeling of fellowship with the gods, but it was not explicit and, after all, common meals and common sitting places of men and gods belonged to the Golden Age (Hesiod fr. 82 Rzach = p. 186 no. 59 Evelyn-White; Pausan. VIII 2. 4) or were a possible ultimate privilege for the best of men.[54] Does not Aristides contrast 'participant in libations' and 'receiver of libations' (p. 150 above)?

The gods received what was due to them, man got what was

Lit. XLIX, 1930) and in Babylonian cult. Cf. W. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites (ed. 3, revised by S. A. Cook), 223 on permission for the poor to partake in an Arab meal-offering.

[52] Plut. Sera num. vind. 13, p. 557 F; Dittenberger (ed. 3) 1106, n. 56.

[53] Cf. Herodas IV 94; Dölger, Ant. u. Chr. I (1929), 5 ff.; A. B. Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda, 271; H. J. Rose, Harv. Theol. Rev., XXXIV, 1941, 5 (on the significance of the ceremonial theft of offerings). Damascius ap. Suid. ss. vv. *ἀθύτους*, *σαρκοφαγία* tells of a philosopher who, needing a diet of meat, would not eat any which had not been sacrificed. (R. Asmus, Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros v. Damaskios aus Damaskos, 80, reconstructs the context.) Semonides 7. 56 *ἄθυστα δ' ἰρὰ πολλάκις κατεσθίει* describes the conduct of a careless woman (for what may be a Phrygian taboo on meat that has not been offered, cf. R. Pettazoni, La confessione dei peccati, III 135 f.).

Greek evidence for spiritual blessings attaching to the flesh of victims is not as clear as might be wished, but the implications of *κοινωνία τῶν ἱερῶν* are clear: there was more than food to share. Cf. Plut. Q. Conv. VIII 8. 3 p. 729 C (Pythagorean abstinence from fish explained on the ground of their preference for what had been offered to the gods).

[54] Cf. Virgil Ecl. IV 63: Epictet. Ench. 15; and for Pythagoreans in the underworld, Aristophon ap. Diog. Laert. VIII 38. Aen. I 79 describes the privilege of a minor deity allowed to sit with his betters. Cf. also p. 164 later.

left and had his natural sanctified enjoyment thereof. Aristotle illustrates associations supposedly made for the sake of pleasure by reference to *thiasotai* and *eranistai* (p. 95, above). Aeschylus Agam. 151 brings out the horror of the sacrifice of Iphigenia by the epithet ἄδαιτος 'whereof no one could partake.'[55] The victim was hallowed and slain, and then in the meal which followed man enjoyed what man might lawfully eat, except in those cults in which by tradition nothing was available for men. κοινωνία τῶν ἱερῶν was a joint participation, by persons entitled through birth or invitation, in ceremonies and sacrificial food and in the blessings which rested thereupon.[56] There was a conscious fellowship of the worshippers with one another, rather than of the worshippers with the deity honored (I Cor. 10. 20 is a Pauline *interpretation* of pagan worship).

Accordingly, I see nothing in ancient ideas about sacrifice to create an intrinsic antipathy to participation in victims offered to the gods of the underworld and to heroes.

(2) In spite of ceremonies of aversion, such as formed part of the Anthesteria, the Greeks had no such fear of ghosts as haunts the Navaho: in fact, they had little sense of repugnance for the dead and for the underworld. We have seen Sarapis as 'lord of the feast for those who at any time come together under his auspices' (p. 150): and yet Sarapis, for all the extension of his functions, was a god of the world of the dead, and Artemidorus classifies him among the chthonioi (II 34 p. 131). Artemidorus again, and though late he is a good witness for popular beliefs at a fairly unsophisticated level, speaks of a dead man as receiving his friends and being host at the meal given at his grave.[57] In the epic, funeral ceremonies were fol-

[55] Cf. l. 43 of oracle in H. Diels, Sibyllinische Blätter, 114 (cf. 65) ἄδαιτον ἔχειν θυσίαν, meaning 'to be outside the range of the sacrifice,' although it is directed to Demeter, Persephone, and Hades.

[56] Cf. Isaeus VIII 16; Plat. Laws IX p. 868 E; p. 70 above. In Supp. epigr. gr. IV 247 the phrase refers to the religious bond between Panamara and Rhodes; cf. ibid. 250, 255; Dittenberger, ed. 3, 1106 n. 5; E. F. Bruck, Totenteil, 233 n. 1.

[57] V, 82, p. 271. 10 Hercher. Cf. E. Pfuhl, Arch. Jahrb. XX (1905), 143 f.; K. Kircher, Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines (Relg. Vers. Vorarb. IX ii), 60 ff.; E. Freistedt, Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage, 98 f.; J. Quasten, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXIII (1940), 253 ff.; S. Xanthoudides, Brit. Sch. Ath. XII (1905/06), 22 (food eaten in modern Greece in memory of the dead, after being blessed in the

lowed by a banquet (Il. XXIII 29, XXIV 801–803, Od. III 309),[58] and Plut. Praec. ger. reip. 15 p. 811D supplies evidence for a banquet (called heroic) with distribution of portions, and contests, about the end of the sixth century B.C.[59] Again, the second libation at a symposion was 'of the heroes': you associated them, just as you did Zeus, with the cup of kindness,[60] even as you left to them, as their right, food which fell from the table: you entertained heroes and gods alike. Contact with a *heroon* sometimes conveyed ritual uncleanness; but this was no greater than the uncleanness remaining from sexual intercourse or contact with a woman in childbirth.[61]

III

Before we come to a consideration of the range of the term *heros*, a word may be said in answer to a question which the reader will perhaps ask: If participation in sacrifice did not involve a notion of table fellowship with the supernatural beings worshipped, and if furthermore there would have been little if any repugnance to table fellowship with the dead, why were there sacrificial ceremonies in which the victim was com-

church and at the grave); D. M. Robinson, Olynthus, XI 188; H. v. Schoenbeck, Arch. Rel. XXXIV, 1937, 76 ff. For analogies in other cultures, cf. A. Thomsen, Arch. XII (1909) 484 ff.; Br. Meissner, Babylonien u. Assyrien, I 428 (note ibid. II 88 that although priests had their share, laymen were here forbidden to eat of things offered to the gods); A. B. Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, 270, 272 (some feeling of aversion); J. G. Frazer, Pausanias, V 228, 230; P. Sartori, Die Speisung der Toten.

[58] Cf. L. Malten, l.c. 300 ff.

[59] Note *ἡρῷα δειπνῶν ἐπιταφίου τινός*. Incidentally Thasos was careful about ritual: cf. n. 4.

[60] Cf. Kircher, op. cit., 17 f. 36 f.; Nilsson, Symbolae O. A. Danielsson, 218 ff.; W. W. Tarn, J. Hell. St. XLVIII (1928) 211 f. (on the honorific association of kings, etc. with wine. In this context, note Kircher 63 on the 'cup' of Hygieia, who apparently received no libation: there is an analogy in the Germanic Minne, cf. Mackensen in Handwört. deutschen Aberglaubens, VI 375 ff. as contrasted with Trankopfer, cf. Eckstein ibid. VIII 1117 ff.). Philostr. Her. II 11 actually says *ξυμπίνειν τῷ Παλαμήδῃ*, but that is parallel to what he says on the Vinetender's intimacy with Protesilaus; cf. ibid. pr. 2 on the hero as entertainer. The jest *ἵν' ὦ σοι ξυμπότης* in Aristoph. Ran. 297 needs no explanation.

[61] In Theophrastus, the Superstitious Man avoids altogether certain things which the ordinary individual would have faced, and followed with a purification, cf. Eurip. fr. 472.

pletely destroyed? The answer must needs be provisional; it involves matters lying outside the scope of this inquiry, and I cannot claim to have made an adequate examination of the evidence which is extensive, scattered, and confusing (our sources are only too often either careless or schematic). Any neat general formulation is almost certain to do violence to the facts.[62]

There are two categories of holocaust. First, there are offerings to persons who have lived and died and who are supposed to need real sustenance and nourishment — and this need is naturally ascribed to unhistorical characters once they are supposed actually to have lived and died. Secondly, there are offerings which may best be called *heilige Handlungen*, ceremonies wherein an animal was consumed (not always by fire) in a proceeding intended to exercise direct and efficacious influence upon divine powers or upon forces of nature.

As for the first, though the hero at Tronis was content with blood, which is what the dead in Homer craved, and though liquids and vegetable offerings and cakes came to predominate in funerary offerings,[63] the mighty dead were often thought to require a whole victim. For naïve Greeks, sacrifice was the food of the gods also, but it was far less natural to suppose that the gods *needed* their share of sacrifice. The heroes could be credited with appetite and jealousy for their rights; an element of malignity is at times imputed to them.

Secondly, we have such ceremonies as the fertility rites of the Thesmophoria, wherein pigs were thrown into a chasm, and the symbolic offering of puppies to the war god Enyalios and purificatory rites with the use of the same animal (we may compare

[62] I am in substantial agreement with Ph. E. Legrand (in Daremberg-Saglio, IV 972), save that I reject any supposed scruples against partaking in company with the dead, etc. There is a great range of possible variety; cf. Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda, 69 f. for avoidance of that which is to be treated as specially holy.

[63] Cf. 145 above. I assume that P. Stengel, Herm. XXVII (1892) 166 rightly interprets ἀναλοῦν in Pausan. X 4. 10 (Ziehen in Pauly-Wissowa, IIIA 1676 has slight reservations). Cf. also S. Eitrem, S. Oslo., VIII (1929), 35 for libations as the chief offerings to heroes, and again Eitrem's earlier remarks, Griech. Reliefs (Christiania Forhandl. 1909 ix), 21. After all, liquids are obviously absorbed into the ground.

the *augurium canarium*, the *October equus*, and the Robigalia at Rome). Again, there are *sphagia* in general, oath-sacrifices (except for Pausan. V 24. 10, which is perhaps explained by its setting in the Olympian festival), offerings of victims in a crisis, cathartic sacrifices (wherein the animal or its blood, like the 'fleece of Zeus,' is good magic) and various ceremonies to avert evil. The destruction of the animal was complete in almost all of these, whether the gods invoked in historical time came from the clear air of Olympus or from the earth or from the underworld.[64] Human sacrifices, whether offered or said to be offered to Zeus Lykaios, Zeus Laphystios, Artemis, or Dionysos Omestes or again without the naming of any supernatural character, constitute a classic instance. They are powerful forms of action: the slaying of Iphigenia is 'a cure for a bitter storm' (Aesch. Agam. 198 f.: to Clytaemnestra in her bitterness, 'a spell against the Thracian blasts,' 1418. For *her*, Agamemnon's death is sacrificial; 1432 f.).

For this second category, would it not be true to say that non-participation followed upon the purpose and atmosphere of the ritual and upon the disposition or aspect imputed to the deities rather than upon their identity or supposed habitat? After all, Jahwe received holocaust and communion sacrifice alike. In fact, Pausanias VIII 34. 3 tells how when the Eumenides were about to make Orestes mad, they appeared black to him; but, when he had bitten off a finger, they appeared to be white and he recovered his reason and made *enagismos* to the first, by way of averting their anger but did sacrifice (ἔθυσε) to

[64] Cf. Julian's remarks as discussed in Appendix 1 and S. Eitrem, S. Oslo., XVIII (1938), 9 ff. There is something of an analogy between the slaying of Polyxena for Achilles and that of Iphigenia for Artemis.

I say 'the gods invoked in historical times,' since a number of such ceremonies are predeistic or at least antedate the specific deities ultimately concerned. Cf. M. P. Nilsson, J. Hell. Stud. XLIII, 1923, 144 on fire-festivals as a striking instance of this type of ceremony; A. Bertholet, Sitzungsber. Berlin, 1938, 175 f.; S. Eitrem, S. Oslo. XVIII 16 ff. (this last for the idea that the *keres* etc. were kept at arm's length). [Demosth.] LIX 73 ἔπραξε, 75 illustrate the idea of specific action (though nb. *facio* of any sacrifice). For sacrifice-action, cf. Pausan. II 24. 1 (monthly *nocturnal* sacrifice of a lamb to Apollo at Argos: the prophetess tastes the blood and becomes possessed by the god). Cf. on nocturnal ceremonials M. P. Nilsson, Entstehung . . . griech. Kalenders (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, I, xiv, 21, 1918), 17 ff.

the white ones. This may or may not reflect historic duality of ritual; it certainly shows the significance of the aspect of the deity.[65] As Fairbanks remarked in this connection, we know a Zeus and a Hermes of the earth; in developed mythology Artemis has three aspects, and so later has Aphrodite; even the Winds have two.[66] Hecate was notably associated with darkness and death but even she had a wider range of action. Not only rough characters, such as Demosthenes LIV 39 describes, but also the poor, who were presumably not less superstitious than the rich, were said to eat the meals set out for her; to do so was contrary to good custom, and might be credited with unpleasant results (Petron. 134); but it was not, like a high-voltage wire, a major danger which could not be ignored. After all, Hecate was also a goddess who gave blessings and many personal names were derived from her. Again, Persephone was corn goddess as well as goddess of the dead and Pluton had a similar duality of functions. Gods of the dead as such received little formal worship. They might inspire fear and aversion, but with the exception of the Erinyes and sometimes Hecate, they did not harm the living (cf. Appendix 3).

Further, most forms of supernatural activity are common to Olympians and *chthonioi*. Both are invoked in curses. Again, the gate is guarded by Apollo as well as by Hermes, Hecate, and heroes; oracles are given by the powers of the earth and by Zeus and Apollo; epileptic possession and the like come from

[65] Cf. Fairbanks, Am. J. Phil. XXI, 1900, 258. He infers participation also in the offerings to the Semnai (Eumenides) described by Pausan. I 28. 6, a conclusion to which some support is lent by Schol. in Soph. O. C. 489 (which suggests though it does not prove that the Hesychidai, unlike the Eupatridai, shared in offerings to these goddesses).

Nilsson, Symbolae Danielsson, 224 f. has shown how Zeus Meilichios was transformed and Pausan. X 38. 8 may indicate a phase of transition. If, as has been postulated (n. 19), *ἱερώσυνα* imply participation, the Marathonian tetrapolis had communion-sacrifice in its cults of the Tritopatreis and Akamantes (J. v. Prott, Fasti sacri, 46 ff. no. 26).

[66] Stengel, Opferbräuche, 150. H. Bolkestein, Theophrastos' Charakter der Deisidaimonia, 46 puts the question 'hat nicht jede apotropäische Gottheit diese-n Doppelcharakter?' A lyric fragment in Stobaeus I 5. 12 p. 76 Wachsmuth addresses Klotho and Lachesis as *οὐράνιαι χθόνιαί τε δαίμονες· ὦ πανδείμαντοι* and entreats them to send Eunomia, Justice and Peace and to cause the city to forget grievous happenings.

the Mother, Poseidon, Enodia, Apollo Nomios, Ares, and daimones; the *theoi apotropaioi*, the averters of evil, include Zeus and Apollo in addition to Earth, Hecate, heroes and unnamed figures; [67] almost any god or hero could help in war.[68]

Enagismos and *thysia* have in common the fundamental fact that a victim is presented before a supernatural being or beings: [69] they probably share also the use of lustral water and the ceremony of κατάρχεσθαι, the cutting of a hair from the victim's forehead and throwing of it into the flames.[70] Nevertheless, *enagismos* is not simply *thysia* lacking participation, and lacking it because of a fear of fairy food: it is a distinct type of action, the tabooing of an animal or removal of it from the secular sphere.

Enagismos is distinct also in that it commonly involves an altogether different and positive emphasis on the blood of victims. When animals were offered in sacrifice with participation, *thysia*, their blood was shed with due solemnity, at or before an altar. Often it was caught in a bowl, and what fell on the altar was not cleaned away — any more than the ashes of the sacrificial fire were removed. Nevertheless, the blood had not here any such specific function as it had in offerings to persons and powers of the underworld. In such sacrifices, the blood was deemed to satisfy a specific desire. So again it was 'good medicine' in various rites of purification or atonement. It is possible that some of the associations of the use of blood in propitiation entered the mind of a worshipper when he was making a sacrifice with participation, but if so, they were

[67] On guardians of the gate, etc., cf. E. Norden, Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern, 159 ff. — On epilepsy, etc., cf. Hippocr. Morb. sacr. 4 (ibid. terrors at night are ascribed to Hecate and heroes); F. Cumont, L'Égypte des astrologues, 167 (an inscription from Panamara published by P. Roussel, Bull. Corr. Hell. LV, 1931, 73 line 5, speaks of a state like madness as caused by some kind of Erinyes, but this may be regarded as literary. Cf. again Aristoph. Pax 39 ff.). — For the deities involved in apotropaic ceremonies cf. Jessen in Pauly-Wissowa, II 189 f.; Suppl. epigr. gr. IX 72. 5 f. (Apollo); P. Oxy. 885 43 ff. (Zeus Keraunios, Heracles, Tyche Soteira, after a statue has been struck by lightning).

[68] Cf. Dittenberger, ed. 3, 1122; Xen. Hipparch. 7. 4, 8. 7.

[69] Cf. H. Wheeler Robinson, J. Theol. Stud. XLIII (1942), 131 on sacrifice in general, with special reference to the Old Testament.

[70] For both ceremonies cf. Johanna Schmidt, Freiwilliger Opfertod bei Euripides, 83 f.; for κατάρχεσθαι, cf. Plut. Them. 13 and A. S. Pease on Aen. IV 698.

well beneath the surface. The contrast with Semitic sacrifices and with any emphasis on the blood as being the life is clear.

IV

Finally, we must remember that the term *heros* often meant 'minor deity' and not 'man who lived and died and subsequently received veneration.' Hero-cult, like Greek ritual in general, represents the result of a gradual development in which we can see notable influences of the period of legalism which Nilsson has taught us to understand.[71] *Enagismos* became normative for hero-cult in general, but sacrifice with participation was the natural thing for a Greek in ordinary circumstances. Does not Theophrastus ap. Porph. Abst. II 26 observe that if the Jews bade us Greeks sacrifice in their way (i.e. as holocaust), we should give up the practice? (Cf. Appendix 4.) Special reasons apart, a Greek could not waste so much good meat.

Enagismos to heroes was a development of the homage paid to outstanding individuals in prehistoric (at least later prehistoric) and historic times. Their cult had firm roots in local soil and its place in the civic pattern was enhanced by Homer and Hesiod on the one hand, and by Delphi on the other. The idea that heroes were dead men whose relics might be transferred [72] became dominant in thought and writing, but not equally in cult. Many figures called 'hero' or 'heroine' were not of this kind and were intrinsically little gods or goddesses — not faded gods necessarily, but little local deities who never rose to wider regional or universal greatness, or again supernatural beings subordinate or subordinated to gods.[73] Perhaps

[71] History of Greek Religion, 180 ff. — Cf. the argument of R. J. Bonner–G. Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle, I 53, II 192 ff., that the whole idea of pollution by homicide is secondary and artificially grafted onto court procedure.

[72] Cf. Wilamowitz, Glaube, II 11, on the lateness of this, so far as our knowledge goes. For the general dichotomy, cf. Pausan. I 29. 2 *θεῶν ἐστιν ἱερὰ καὶ ἡρώων καὶ ἀνδρῶν τάφοι.*

[73] Artemidor. II 40 p. 146 speaks of heroes and *daimones*, and IV 78, p. 248 of heroes and *heroides*, as signifying in dreams the same things as the gods but with a smaller degree of power (II 13, p. 106 heroes, as a category, figure at

the one constant element in the use of the term 'hero' is that the figures so designated are not of national or universal significance.

Otherwise, the heroes are highly disparate; Farnell in his classic work makes seven categories. It is not surprising that there was diversity of usage,[74] and that a ritual with participation was employed even in the cult of heroes who had been men. Terminology and ritual were not stereotyped; two official Attic inscriptions refer to the Heros Iatros by that name, and then quote the Council as proposing a measure in which he is called ὁ θεός.[75] It should not be forgotten that the Pythagorean precepts in Diog. Laert. VIII 33 (cf. A. Delatte, Vie de Pythagore, Mém. acad. roy. Belg. XVII ii, 1922, 229) include 'gods and heroes must not be accorded equal honors: the gods must always be worshipped with silence, in white garments and purity, the

---

the end of a list of gods). Artemidorus speaks only of θυσία, never of ἐναγισμός, etc.; so also the quotations in F. Cumont, L'Égypte des astrologues, from astrological texts, which reflect a social level similar to that of Artemidorus. When heroes are set in relation to deities, it is by way of individual or generic subordination, not of the contrast between two opposite worlds; cf. Aristophan. fr. 488 for a comparison between the cult of the gods and of the dead.

For the genesis of the category of heroes, cf. L. Radermacher, Mythos u. Sage bei den Griechen, 274, 'Man könnte sich denken, dass die Gestalt des Heros ihrer Konzeption nach und von Haus aus Gott und Mensch zugleich ist, ein Mittler zwischen beiden Sphären, in dieser Art Geschöpf gläubiger Phantasie nicht anders als Zeus, und Mischwesen nicht anders als der Kentaur und seinesgleichen. Zum Heros wird dann auch ein Mensch emporgestiegen oder ein Gott hinabgesunken sein,' a passage to which Professor Bonner drew my attention. Cf. n. 21 above for the view that the subordination of a hero to a god is not always secondary. Against any exaggerated denial of the historicity of heroes, cf. W. R. Halliday, Indo-European Folk-Tales and Greek Legend, 61.

The term 'patron' was proposed by B. Schweitzer, Gött., gel. Anz. 1928, 2 for minor supernatural beings such as are here discussed.

[74] Cf. Th. Schreiber, Studien über d. Bildniss Alexanders d. Gr. (Abh. sächs. Ges. Wiss. XXI iii, 1903), 243 ff. The control of Delphi was present but not ubiquitous: contrast pp. 143, 147 and Arrian Anab. IV 11. 7 (Heracles not given divine honors till the Delphic oracle so ordered: so VII 14. 7, Ammon forbade divine honors for Hephaestion) with Plut. Mul. virt. 18 p. 255 D–E (the citizens gave Lampsake heroic honors first, and later voted to sacrifice to her as a goddess; as always, we must remember Plutarch's devotion to the Delphic oracle; in the light of it, his matter-of-fact tone is all the more important).

[75] Ziehen, Leges graecorum sacrae, 109 ff. no. 38a, b. (IG II² 839–840; 221/20 B.C. and end second century B.C.); cf. above, pp. 82, 85. In IG II² 1252 τοὺς θεοὺς naturally covers Amynos, Asclepius, Dexion.

heroes from midday onwards." Many of the accompanying ordinances agree with our extant *leges sacrae*, but it is perhaps significant that the prohibition should have been thought necessary.

Further, the same Pythagorean source forbids the eating of fishes as sacred 'for the same things must not be allotted to gods and to men any more than they should be to free men and to slaves' (Diog. Laert. VIII 34). A. Delatte, Études sur la littérature Pythagoricienne, 291 remarks that a parallel passage (noted n. 32 above) shows that the gods by reason of whom we should abstain from fish are gods of the underworld; nevertheless the statement is general.

Again, Plato's emphasis on a separation of chthonic and heavenly gods in his Laws (IV p. 717 A, VIII p. 828 C) represents a theoretical hardening of the division of categories into a sharp contrast: and the former passage is contrary to common custom and may draw on Pythagorean formulations (cf. Fr. Boehm, De symbolis Pythagoreis, 58 f.; G. Rohde, Kultsatzungen, 37). We may compare Laws XI p. 914 B, on which Wilamowitz comments, Glaube, I 176. There is a certain parallel in the taboo on picking up food which has fallen; cf. Boehm 26 f. and H. J. Rose, Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Phil. XII, 1941, 92 n. 8. Pliny, N. H. XX 113, quotes a prohibition on the use of parsley: as is there said, parsley was commonly associated with the dead, but it also adorned the brows of the victors in the Isthmia (Plut. Timol. 25. 3) and of Horace's friends (Odes I 36. 16). Further, though the use of the bean in ceremonies for the dead is sometimes given as a reason for taboos on its eating, these taboos were very far from being generally observed, and other grounds were freely assigned for them. Normally the dead were given things acceptable to the living. We must always be on our guard against schematism and oversimplification: cf. n. 5. We see a striking absence of differentiation between celestial and chthonic deities in Iliad XV 193, 224; Aesch. Ag. 88 ff. (*βωμοί* of all types of gods); Eur. Hec. 146; and even Plato, Laws XII p. 958 D.

As Wilamowitz said in a much larger sense (Glaube, II 246), Plato saw the need of a new religion; when he follows tradition, it could be of the Pythagorean rather than of the civic type.

After all, though the ubiquitous influence of epic,[76] the meter of which is called 'heroic' as early as Plato, caused the word to have a primary association with the mighty dead of the Heroic Age, the word itself was once a term of respect, like *kyrios*, *dominus*, Messire, my lord; that is certain, even if *ἤρω Διόννσε* in

[76] Cf. Eitrem, Symb. Oslo., XIV (1935), 54 ff. on the application of the names Nauseiros and Phaiax to independent supernatural beings connected with seamanship, as also on their secondary attachment to Theseus (whereon cf. also H. Herter, Rhein. Mus. LXXXVIII, 1939, 304). So at least the *names* Ioleos and Eurysaces (p. 145 above) are due to general Hellenic, and not Attic, mythology.

Plut. Quaest. Gr. 31 p. 299 B is open to doubt.[77] *Heros* commonly denoted also minor supernatural figures, sometimes simply called 'the hero' (as is Echelos in the old orgeonic regulation); sometimes with a functional title, e.g. the 'Hero Healer.' There is no indication that any orgeonic hero had relics, a grave, a bothros or a tube through which offerings could be poured into the earth. Heroes of this type were like the Nymphs[78] and the 'gods in a small way';[79] and they were very numerous, perhaps particularly so in Attica.[80] How far the word *heros* was from necessarily involving chthonic associations or a human past is shown by Aristoph. Nub. 314-315. It has thundered and the Clouds have sung two odes in response to the prayers of Socrates but neither he nor Strepsiades has seen them. Strepsiades asks, 'Who are these women, Socrates, who have made this solemn utterance? Surely they are not heroines of a kind, are they?'[81]

As Nilsson has remarked, such minor supernatural figures were probably closer than the high gods to the ordinary man;

[77] Cf. Wilamowitz, Glaube, II 8 ff.: F. Cumont, Am. J. Arch. 1933, 237 ff.; also Kern, Rel. d. Gr., I 130 on *παῖς ἥρως*.

[78] It may be noted that the use of the paean was forbidden for the Nymphs on Thasos (Dittenberger, ed. 3, 1033, Seyrig, Bull. Corr. Hell. LI, 1927, 180 ff.); but a paean 'beside the Nymphs' as also 'beside Hecate' was ordered at Miletus (Dittenberger, ed. 3, 57).

[79] Anth. Pal. IX 334 *τὸν ἐν σμικροῖς ὀλίγον θεόν*, of Tychon, with O. Kern, Wien. St. XLV (1926), 116 f.: H. Herter, De dis Atticis Priapi similibus, 31 and De Priapo, 240. For a similar figure cf. Fr. Schwenn, Pauly-Wissowa V A 1710 s.v. Theodaimon.

[80] Cf. Nilsson, Am. J. Phil. LIX (1938), 392. How many of the hundred *archegetai* of Arist. Ath. Pol. 21. 6 can we name? Note also S. Eitrem, Symb. Osloenses, XVIII (1938), 16 n. 2 on the probable origin of the hero Hesychos: again the presence of *ἥρωορ(-s)* eight times, synonymous *ἥρω* once and *ἡρώων* once on a single altar at Olympia (Dittenberger-Purgold, Inschr. v. Olympia, 675 ff. no. 662; O. Kern, Rel. d. Gr. I 128; Wilamowitz, Pindaros, 211, 'der alte Ortsdämon').

[81] 'demi-déesses,' as G. Méautis says: Rev. hist. rel. CXVIII (1938), 95. Apoll. Rhod. IV 1309 speaks of 'heroines who guard Libya,' *ἡρῷσσαι Λιβύης τιμήοροι*: 1322–23 they describe themselves as *χθόνιαι θεαὶ αὐδήεσσαι, ἡρῷσσαι, Λιβύης τιμήοροι ἠδὲ θυγάτρες*; they are clearly identical with II 504 f. *χθονίαις παρακάτθετο νύμφαις, αἳ Λιβύην ἐνέμοντο* and with the *ἡρωΐδες* of Callimach. fr. 126, *ἡρῷσσαι* of Nicaenetus, A. P. VI 225. Cf. the hero Ptoios (P. Perdrizet, Bull. Corr. Hell. XXII, 1898, 244). In Callimach. H. III 184-85, nymphs and *heroides* are clearly synonymous.

the village deities in India today present an analogy. A Heros of Menander almost certainly appears in Latin as *Lar familiaris*;[82] he was a patron saint of a modest order of magnitude. We read in Aristoph. Vesp. 819 ff.:

> *Philocleon.* 'If only you would bring out to me the shrine of Lykos!'
> *Bdelycleon.* 'Here it is, and here is the Lord himself.'
> *Philocleon.* 'O master hero, how stern your aspect is after all.'

Lykos — in the shape of a wolf — had his abode by the courts; Philocleon's fevered imagination craves a sight of the 'hero,' and he is shown a painting of his dear if unlovely patron.[83] Parody is a distortion of fact; it is not fiction. Lykos might be the juror's hero; but Echelos and the Heroines evoked the gentler piety of the religion of the good earth and of the annual reunion of those who met year by year for their inherited duty and privilege.

[82] Wilamowitz, Glaube, II 16 n. 3 denies this on the ground that a hero does not usually dwell in a private home; but the hero of some little shrine before the gate could be deemed to dwell in the house, as Heracles is said to do in a couplet used to ward off evil

> ὁ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς καλλίνικος Ἡρακλῆς
> ἐνθάδε κατοικεῖ. μηδὲν εἰσίτω κακόν

(references in O. Weinreich, Arch. XVIII, 1915, 9 ff.). In any event, cf. Babrius 63; also τοῦ κατ' οἰκίαν ἥρως in Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. IV 2. ἥρως οἰκουρός in Plut. Fort. Rom. 10 p. 323 C corresponds to *Laris familiaris* in Plin. N. H. XXXVI 204, as does ἡρώων to *Larum* in the Greek version of Res Gestae Diui Augusti, 19. (θεοῖς ἥρωσι is also used as an equivalent of *Dis Manibus*; P. Roussel, Rev. ét. anc. XIV, 1912, 380 — but so are again θεοῖς καταχθονίοις, θεοῖς δαίμοσι, cf. C. B. Welles, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXIV, 1941, 84. Incidentally, in Apul. de mundo, 35, *geniis ministratur* corresponds to ἡρώων θεραπεῖαι in [Aristot.] p. 400 b. 22.)

[83] On the earlier invocation (389 ff.) cf. H. Kleinknecht, Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike (Tüb. Beitr. XXVIII, 1937), 63. For the painting, cf. Aeneas Tacticus 31. 15 πινάκιον ἡρωϊκόν which implies a regular type: also Eustathius in Il. II 529 p. 275.44, on the Locrian way of representing the two heroes called Aias, ἱστέον δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν οἱ Ὀπούντιοι Λοκροὶ γραφὰς ἤτοι εἰκόνας γεγραμμέναζ τῶν δύο Αἰάντων ἔχοντες οὐ κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν ἔγραψαν (P. von der Mühll, Der grosse Aias, 16 f. drew attention to this text and suggested that the statement comes from Apollodorus. It cannot be a mere figment, and clearly refers to a regular type of painting.)

APPENDIX 1 (see page 150)

KOINΩNEIN IN JULIAN P. 176 D

The use of the verb *κοινωνεῖν* in Julian's oration to the Mother of the Gods p. 176 D may be thought to indicate a sense of table fellowship with the gods and certainly the passage seems to call for interpretation. Julian has been concerned to explain the taboo on the eating of *σπέρματα* at the time of Cybele's spring festival (p. 174 A), and passes to the taboo on fish. The chief reason for this is, he says (p. 176 C), that we ought not to eat things which we do not sacrifice to the gods.[84]

Julian then meets the objections of a supposed adversary who had referred to exceptional sacrifices. He allows that unusual victims were offered in certain solemn sacrifices,[85] 'as the Romans offer a horse, and as Greeks and Romans offer dogs to Hecate'; *καὶ πολλὰ παρ' ἄλλοις ἐστὶ τῶν τελεστικῶν, καὶ δημοσίᾳ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους ἢ δὶς τοιαῦτα θύματα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ταῖς τιμητηρίοις*[86] (sc. *θυσίαις*), *ὧν μόνον*[87] *κοινωνεῖν ἄξιον καὶ τραπεζοῦν θεοῖς*. No such exceptional victims fit honorific sacrifices, the character of which is given in *ὧν . . . θεοῖς*; fish are not offered in them, for we do not tend and breed fish.

What is the meaning of *ὧν μόνον κοινωνεῖν ἄξιον καὶ τραπεζοῦν θεοῖς*? Petavius read *ἐφ' ὧν*, emended *τραπεζοῦν* to *τραπεζῶν*, and translated *per quae sola communes cum Diis mensas habere possumus*. C. W. King has 'of which alone it is lawful for the gods to partake and ban-

[84] For this principle cf. F. J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ, II 17 f. etc.

[85] *ἔν τισι τελεστικαῖς θυσίαις* i.e. in the type described p. 158 above as *heilige Handlungen*.

[86] This epithet, used by Julian also in his Contra Galilaeos, seems to be peculiar to him; cf. Cyril's comment *καί, κατά γε τὸ αὐτῷ δοκοῦν, τιμητήρια* (Iuliani Contra Christianos, ed. Neumann p. 217. 6). It arises naturally out of the general character of ancient sacrifice; a linguistic influence of the Latin *honorarium* or of the use of the adjective *honorarius* to describe voluntary offerings, as distinct from prescribed or piacular offerings, is at best a remote possibility (Julian does speak of the October equus: and he was thinking of Rome, p. 159 C).

The elaborate treatment of sacrifice and *honor* by Arnobius VII 13 ff. is well discussed by W. Kroll Rh. Mus. LXXII (1917), 89 ff. He points to various contacts with Porphyry, e.g. the principle that men do not sacrifice that of which they do not eat. Further study might be rewarding; certainly there was a large literature on sacrifice, as again on Pythagorean taboos. Julian p. 191C speaks of the swarms of writings on vegetarianism.

[87] Hertlein emends to *μόνων*; as Professor Jaeger remarks, this is hardly necessary; cf. Julian I 36 p. 56. 9 H, p. 63.32 Bidez.

quet upon'; Mau 'bei denen allein wir Tischgemeinschaft mit den Göttern haben dürfen'; Asmus 'an welchen allein wir mit den Göttern zusammen an ihren Tischen speisen dürfen (similarly F. J. Dölger, ΙΧΘΥΣ, II 18); W. C. Wright 'in which alone the gods deign to join us and to share our table.' Liddell-Scott-Jones 1811a, while indicating a doubt as to the reading τραπεζοῦν, also makes it 'receive an offering.'

κοινωνεῖν is always a difficult word, but τραπεζοῦν, though rare, is clear: 'set on a table (before)'. Again, the force of ἄξιον should not be attenuated in translation: it means not 'it is legitimate or lawful' but 'it is right and proper' (ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον, *dignum et justum est* in the Christian liturgies). Surely we must render κοινωνεῖν, not as 'take a share of' but as 'give a share of,' just as in Julian Orat. I 36 (p. 56. 11 H., p. 63. 34 Bidez), and in two other instances in his works (F. Boulenger, Essai critique sur le syntaxe de l'Empereur Julien, 74). κοινωνεῖν states in general terms what τραπεζοῦν puts concretely. The whole means 'of which alone it is appropriate to give the gods a share and to set it before them'.[88] This implies that we *keep* and use part — but that is no more than a commonplace of practice and of observation from Hesiod onwards.

[κοινωνία is probably applied to sacrifice in an Epicurean fragment, P. Oxy 215 ii 33. The papyrus is defective at this point but Diels was clearly right in restoring the general sense: 'Diese Gemeinschaft aber *zwischen Göttern und Menschen, wenn sie wirklich bestünde, würde ich für ein grosses Unglück halten, da sie über das Grab hinaus ihre Wirkung erstreckte*, bis nach den Leichenfeierlichkeiten, wenn man verbrannt wird' (Sitzungsber. Berlin, 1916, 904). It is the relationship to the gods involved in paying tribute to them from fear or from other prudential considerations.]

[88] Sacrifices of the 'telestic' type are performed before the gods, but are not offered to them in the normal way; the victims are destroyed and there are no portions to offer on a sacred table.

APPENDIX 2 (see page 154)

EVIDENCE AGAINST TABLE FELLOWSHIP IN ROMAN SACRIFICE

We can, I think, offer formal proof that, at least for certain ancient Roman sacrifices, the idea of table fellowship with the gods is completely excluded. Cato says of the annual meal for Juppiter Dapalis, *ubi daps profanata comestaque erit* (50) and *Ioui caste profanato sua contagione* (132; cf. G. Rohde, Die Kultsatzungen der römischen Pontifices, 85 ff. The difficult problem presented by the last two words does not concern us here). *Profanum* is the antithesis to *sacrum*, and *profanare* means 'to desacralize.' The food and drink had been surrendered to the deities: that surrender applied to the total offering, not simply to as much as man did not propose to consume, and the Romans said *macte hoc porco*, etc., not *macte his extis* (O. Skutsch-H. J. Rose, Cl. Q. XXXVI, 1942, 17). Yet when the appropriate portion had been given to the gods, the worshippers might properly and safely partake of the rest as of ordinary food. We do not know of any specific rite of profanation, but in effect the taboo was lifted.

It is the more noteworthy, since the *daps* is a ceremony particularly capable of suggesting table fellowship; and there are similar if somewhat puzzling indications for thank-offerings to Hercules Inuictus at the Ara Maxima (cf. G. Wissowa, Religion u. Kultus, ed. 2, 278 f. and K. Latte in Pauly-Wissowa, IX 1132; Krause, ibid. Supp. V 279. Here, as in very few old cults at Rome, none of the food offered might be carried away).[89] We may perhaps be justified in generalizing, as Wissowa does (op. cit. 419), from these instances. Again, contrary to Greek custom, the Arval brothers partook of certain expiatory offerings, *piacula*, and this also was probably common Roman practice (cf. S. P. Tromp, De Romanorum Piaculis, e.g. 126, 131 f.). The essence of the act lay in the presentation of an offering; thereafter the substance or remains of the offering became or were neutral and indifferent; this fits the legal precision of the Roman mind.[90]

[89] Did *statim ibidem consumito* (Cato, R. R. 83) involve a feeling that the action of offering must be visibly completed? Neither at Rome nor in Greece, where the obligation to complete the eating of sacrifice on the spot is somewhat more frequent, is this obligation reinforced by any expressed fear of consequences such as we occasionally find in other cultures (cf. F. B. Jevons, Introduction to the History of Religion, 147).

[90] *Sanguinem gustare antea frequenter solebant* in a new fragment of the Fasti Praenestini, discussed by G. Wissowa, Hermes LVIII (1923), 378, has apparently

To sum up, the available evidence suggests that the Romans did not think of a communion with deities in food, and, unlike the Vedic Indians and, apparently, the Greeks, did not even feel that some measure of blessing attached to food after its consecration in sacrifice (cf. n. 53. Servius on Verg. Aen. VIII 183, *nam de hoc boue immolato Herculi carnes carius uendebantur causa religionis* is part of a wrong attempt to explain *perpetui bouis* in Virgil; so Wissowa remarked, op. cit. 279, n. 2. At Rome, as in Greece, the use of the skin of a sacrificed animal was mandatory for certain purposes: cf. J. Pley, De lanae in antiquorum ritibus usu, 15, 38 f. and, for the Luperci, H. J. Rose, Mnemosyne, LX, 1933, 393 ff. Was there some idea that this skin was lucky, since a victim sacrificed was proved to be acceptable to the gods? In any event, with the Greeks, the skin of the victim, except in holocaust, was just a marketable commodity.) There was a transfer and a partial resumption of ownership: and that although, for Roman as for Greek, participation was not only the end, but also an integral part of the whole act of sacrifice. Need I refer to the Decian *libelli*?

---

no special significance; at least no significance is made explicit. Warde Fowler, Religious Experience of the Roman Republic, 33 f. has remarked on the slightness of the importance attached by the Romans to blood. *Sacroque cruore* in Virg. Aen. V 333 is a mere phrase; the blood had been allowed to flow freely on the race-track; cf. p. 161 above.

APPENDIX 3 (see page 160)

DEITIES AND RITES OF AVERSION

Isocrates V 117, by way of encouraging King Philip to beneficence, draws a contrast between the gods responsible for blessings and called Olympians, and the gods set over misfortunes and punishments and less agreeably named: to the first, he says, private individuals and cities erect temples and altars, while the second are not honored in prayers and sacrifices, but we perform ceremonies to keep them away (*apopompai*).

What is this second category? Probably Hecate, the Erinyes (when not made kindly), figures seldom worshipped like Hades (Soph. Aj. 607) or hardly ever like Thanatos: perhaps also vague powers not strictly deified, e.g. the entourage of Hecate, and again *alastores* (avenging spirits: this word is name or epithet), the *keres*, the *strinx* (O. Weinreich, Gebet u. Wunder, 12 n. = Genethliakon W. Schmid, 178 n.), or something like Envy or the evil eye, as they later appear in Roman texts. They were powers that could harm or punish (cf. the warning to the jury in Antiphon I 31): you placated them when necessary, but you kept your dealings with them at a minimum.

There may well be a somewhat wider implication. Ceremonies to avert evil are a normal part of worship (Theophrast. ap. Porph. Abst. II 24) but could easily assume a sinister aspect: Porph. Abst. II 44 speaks of purification after them. They can in a measure project something of this character upon the deities to whom they are directed, even though these deities are invoked as protectors. *Apotropaios* and *apotropos* have a double sense, 'averting' and 'to be averted' (so Suidas s.v. ἀποτρόπαιος). After all, you were asking such deities to *remove* something, ἀποπομπή, ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι, ἀποτροπιασμός, etc., not to *come* with blessing. 'Averting' is parallel to the propitiation of the anger of deities (cf. Plut. Fab. 18 πρὸς ἱλασμοὺς θεῶν ἢ τεράτων ἀποτροπάς). Such action, like purifications, continued to be a familiar type of ritual proceeding (cf. P. Tebt. 140, for an actual instance in 72 B.C.: Ptol. Tetrab. I 3. 16 p. 32 Robbins and Cat. codd. astrol. V i, 211 for the generic type. Astrological texts give considerable evidence for belief in demoniac possession and for states of religious anxiety. Cf. also Plut. Is. Os. 30 f. pp. 362 E, 363 B on rites directed to Typhon). The implications were the more sinister when you propitiated Hecate as queen of the world of darkness (cf. Herbert Scholz, Der Hund in der griechisch-römischen Magie u. Religion, Diss. Berlin 1937, 40 ff.), or Hermes chthonios and the Eumen-

ides as representatives of the offended dead (Phlegon, Mirabilia, 1. The character of the act is not changed by the fact that the king's representative was on this occasion bidden to sacrifice to Hermes, Zeus Xenios, and Ares). This will explain the narrow range frequently ascribed (e.g. in Plut. Q. Conv. VII 6, p. 708 F) to *apotropaioi*, in spite of the wider application of the epithet (n. 67: cf. also J. W. Hewitt, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. XIX, 1908, 109 ff.; ibid. 107 f. he gives parallels for the statement of Isocrates from which we started).

We may compare what Cornutus says about Hecate (ch. 34, p. 72 f. Lang), probably on the basis of Apollodorus (cf. fr. 109 f. in Jacoby, Fragm. d. gr. Hist., II, no. 244, p. 1073 f.). Apollodorus shows a clear understanding of the dual aspect of deities, fr. 97, p. 1060 f., and fr. 102, p. 1065 (the Styx is in itself destructive; the gods are not in intentions and disposition). We have probably lost much in the sixth book of his treatise Concerning the gods, in which he discussed ἀποπομπαῖοι θεοί (fr. 93, p. 1045; cf. Jacoby, Komm. 763 f.).

Hecate, like other deities concerned, had her different side (p. 161, above; n. 78; Plut. Is. Os. 44, p. 368 E): and, in spite of outbursts, in momentary fear or panic or loss, against gods or the gods, the Greeks have no category of divinities generally recognized as essentially malignant, no real Devil or devils such as Ahriman came to be (Nock, J. Rom. Stud., XXX, 1940, 194 f.). Plut. Is. Os. 46, p. 369 E is a vivid instance of something foreign. Plutarch in his De Superstitione speaks of fear as directed towards the gods in general and not towards one category; so did Epicurus earlier. Does not Pausanias observe (I 28. 6) that there is nothing terrifying about the images of the Semnai or the representations of other underworld deities in the sanctuary of the first at Athens? It is instructive to look at the long list of deities addressed in the so-called Orphic Hymns. The Erinyes are mentioned as with real fear (69); there is some such feeling towards Keraunios Zeus, (19), Nereus (23), Korybas (39; invoked to avert his anger and all ghostly perils), Ares (65), and Meilinoe (71; she is asked to show a kindly face), and the Titans are addressed with mild deprecation (37 7–8 as interpreted by H. J. Rose, J. Hell. Stud. LV, 1935, 260; they are theoretical figures). Yet even Thanatos, though asked to come late, is invoked as though kindly (87), and Hermes chthonios is requested to give the initiates a good end (57), while Hecate is placed first (1), and she and her equivalent Antaia (41; cf. 2 to Prothyraia, invoked for aid in childbirth and for deliverance. Wilamowitz, Glaube, I 171 n. 1 regards 1 and 2 as constituting one hymn), and Pluto (18), and Persephone (29) and the Eumenides (70) are invoked to be present or to come. Again, Artemidorus, in discussing the significance in dreams of *theoi chthonioi* (II 34, p. 131,

and 39 p. 144 f.) clearly does not regard them as constituting a hostile group.

Anything that looks like dualism in this area is a matter either of the associations of apotropaic ritual or of a theoretical systematization. We have seen earlier (p. 163) how Pythagoreans occupied themselves with the elaboration of the distinction between Olympians and others, and the name of the school is associated with lists of opposites. So Diogenes Laertius VIII 32 quotes as theirs a doctrine that the air is full of souls regarded as daimones and heroes, that these send dreams, signs, and diseases, and that purifications, apotropaic rites, and divination are addressed to them. This is clearly based on the ideas of Plato Symp. 202 E. Even here the daimones are not like the beings described by Isocrates: the ceremonies are directed towards them, but they are not themselves averted, and the beneficent art of divination is coupled with these grimmer rites.

APPENDIX 4 (see page 162)

THEOPHRASTUS ON THE CONTRAST BETWEEN JEWISH AND GREEK SACRIFICE

J. Bernays, Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit, 111 ff., saw that this, though exaggerated, was a natural contrast between the regular *tamid* offering of a lamb in the Temple every morning and afternoon on the one hand and the infrequence of holocaust in Greece on the other. His discussion is classic and there is little to change in his results save that we should prefer Jaeger's inference, Diokles v. Karystos, 134 ff. that Theophrastus depended on a written source, probably Hecataeus of Abdera, rather than on information obtained by word of mouth. May I add one observation? The ascription of holocaust alone to the Jews need not be regarded as a blunder of Theophrastus or of Hecateus and may be exactly what a Jewish informant of the latter said. The daily sacrifice already mentioned was, for a Jew in Alexandria and even for many in Palestine, the most interesting and important part of the whole regular ritual. Oracula Sibyllina III 573 ff., which is with reason ascribed to an Alexandrian Jew of about 140 B.C. (Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa II A 2125 ff.), prophesies the advent of a holy race of pious men who will glorify great God's temple with libations and incense, yes and with holy hecatombs, with the offering of goodly oxen and full-grown rams, consuming by fire (ὁλοκαρπεύοντες) fat sheep and rams in holy fashion on a great altar. There is here reference to other forms of sacrifice, but the emphasis is on the regular daily holocaust. So we have 'holocausts and sacrifices' in 1 Macc. 1. 45, 1 Sam. 15. 22 (Mark 12. 33): cf. R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, II 828, xiv 1, and again Strack-Billerbeck, Komm. z. N. T., II 550 for the rise of the idea that the sacrifice of peace offering was generally made as a burnt offering.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LUTHER'S EARLIEST EXTANT SERMON

The last few decades of research concerning Luther have been clearly characterized by the close attention paid to his early development. Aided by some remarkable discoveries of hitherto unknown early Luther material, scholars have investigated particularly the important period from roughly 1513 to 1517/18, during which the 'new' religion of Luther evolved and reached its first flowering. The largely uncharted years before 1513, however, still remain in comparative darkness, despite Otto Scheel's notable work which, for all its completeness, is peripheral rather than central so far as the figure of Luther himself is concerned. While Scheel has succeeded in recreating the environment, physical as well as intellectual, in which the boy and youth lived and moved, he has been able to tell us but little of Luther's early spiritual development. The sources available to us unfortunately do not permit our going much beyond what Scheel has so competently presented. A few early letters and the marginal notes of 1509/10 constitute practically the whole body of direct Luther records before 1513. This situation is most regrettable indeed since we do not really know, aside from the general religious background in which Luther grew up, the all-important specific and personal elements characteristic of his early religion. In other words, we do not actually know the individual and intimate features of the religion from which Luther developed into the 'new' religion so wholly and unmistakably his own. With the disappointingly small number of early letters and the difficult marginal notes providing only a very sketchy background at best, our first-hand knowledge of those elusive but decisive pre-reformational years is far from satisfactory.

There is, however, in my opinion, one fairly bright ray of light which may illuminate somewhat the prevailing darkness, for a rather important source of direct information concerning the beginnings of Luther has thus far received less attention than it deserves, — the two early sermons which Erich Vogelsang [1] believes with good reason to date from before 1513. While objective external evidence for assigning a definite year is unfortunately lacking, the subjective internal

[1] Erich Vogelsang, "Zur Datierung der frühesten Lutherpredigten," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, L (1931), 112–145.

evidence points strongly in the direction of the earliest possible origin of these two sermons, perhaps 1510 or, at the latest, 1512.[2]

If Vogelsang's plausible theory is correct it can be construed to constitute a major event in Luther research, and if essentially true, it may be held to be second in importance only to the discovery of the university lectures on Romans. It is my conviction that Vogelsang has 'discovered' precious documents containing the earliest known *connected* presentation of the already then highly individualized religion of Martin Luther. Vogelsang's seemingly successful early dating of these two sermons permits us to take, for the first time, a more than passing glance at the religious development attained by Luther prior to the Dictata super Psalterium. There can be little question that Vogelsang, if right in his basic assumptions, has added extremely significant material to the otherwise disconcertingly meagre sources of our knowledge of Luther before the pivotal year 1513 when the new religion is suggested in the lecture on the first psalm.

In the present paper only the first of these two earliest sermons will be discussed, for since this is in all likelihood the oldest sermon of Luther that has come down to us,[3] it merits analysis. In the absence of any investigations bearing on this subject beyond the brief remarks found in Vogelsang's and Kiessling's [4] studies, it will be advisable to begin with a concise outline of the sermon.

It is based on Matthew 7, 12: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." In the introduction Luther, clearly under the direct or indirect influence of Aristotle, discusses the nature of what men consider to be the good things of life. "Pro p r i m a notandum, quod triplicia sunt bona hominum."[5] The first of the "bona hominum" are merely external: gold, silver, money, servants, property, etc. The second group of goods pertains to the individual himself: health, beauty, reputation, and honor. The third set is spiritual: virtue, charity, faith are among the constituents listed; they are called inner goods because they are said to exist solely in the mind.[5]

After sketching this threefold aspect of human goods Luther proceeds to point out that, with reference to all three, man can behave toward his neighbor in two ways: he can either harm or help him in

[2] Ibid., 116.

[3] Ibid., 115–116.

[4] Elmer C. Kiessling, The Early Sermons of Luther and their Relation to the Pre-Reformation Sermon (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1935), 68–69.

[5] WA 4, 590.

all three fields. Scripture asks us to be governed by two rules in our conduct in general: we are to depart from evil and to do positive good, these two fundamental precepts applying fully to the three stages of "bona" described above.[6]

The main body of the sermon deals, characteristically enough, with the second rule of "fac bonum," [7] a rule significantly termed by Luther "doctrina unica." [7] It is with this "extraordinary and unique" second precept that Luther is primarily, almost exclusively concerned in his earliest extant sermon. Again and again he insists that it is not enough, for the fulfilling of his text, to abstain from harming or wronging one's neighbor: "non sufficit ad salutem, quod aliquis proximo suo non nocet aut non malefacit in his tribus bonis, sed requiritur etiam, ut in ipsis ei prosit et benefaciat." [7]

This stern interpretation, with the accent on the doing of positive good, Luther asserts to be inspired and supported by the threefold authority of reason, Scripture, and analogy.

Reason shows that men who alone abstain from harming their fellow-men are like inanimate objects which do not harm anybody, but such a way of life, largely negative, is wholly inadequate: "nec sufficit . . . ad salutem." [7]

The Bible insists repeatedly that men do positive good to their neighbors. First of all, the very text of this sermon is said to speak clearly of the duty of "facere" and of the insufficiency of an attitude of mere "non nocere." [7] "Prima est thema, quia dicit: 'quaecunque vultis, ut faciant vobis homines.' Non dixit: 'quaecunque vultis, ut non noceant vobis homines, in iisdem non nocete et eis,' licet et hoc verum sit et oporteat esse, sed non sufficit, sed facere etiam aliis debemus." [7] Whoever is found to limit himself to what might be called a purely abstaining life of negative virtues thereby automatically blocks his own way to salvation: "peccat et non merebitur vitam aeternam." [7] In addition to the text of his sermon Luther quotes, in support of his views, the parable of the rich glutton and Lazarus, which he believes demonstrates his main point that merely keeping from doing ill is utterly inadequate. In Luther's opinion, the rich man was not condemned for harming anyone or for loving expensive food and lavish clothes, but primarily for not helping his neighbor Lazarus. "Et iam satis nos docet ista fabula, quod non sufficit non malefacere aut nocere, sed oportet quoque prodesse et benefacere, nec sufficit declinare a malo sed oportet facere et bonum." [7] Luther's

[6] Ibid., 590–591.

[7] Ibid., 591.

third Biblical passage is the parable of the unprofitable servant who buried his talent in the earth and was therefor cast into outer darkness. As Luther sees it, this servant was not condemned because he had robbed others (which evidently he had not done), but simply because he had not given to others. By not helping our neighbor according to our ability we are guilty of hiding our talent and we are condemned together with the unprofitable servant of the parable: "Sic fiet nobis." [7] Luther believes that for salvation nothing will do short of aiding our fellow-men with all our powers. Only this positive action may be said to constitute the truly Christian life, the "vera vita Christianorum," [7] the essential nature of which is thereby identified with the actual doing of good deeds for our neighbor. The fourth scriptural passage is the scene of the Last Judgment when Christ will not be concerned with the fact that we have not hurt our neighbor but rather with the really serious offense that we have not helped him: " . . . facere oportet bene, et non solum non facere." [8] Fifthly, Augustine is quoted as his final scriptural (*sic!*) authority: "pasce esurientem: si non pavisti, occidisti." [8] If we neglect to feed a hungry man and if, as a consequence of our neglect, he dies, we are fully guilty of his death: " . . . tu occidisti, teutonice: ist gleich so viel als hettestu in getodtet." [8] Man is strictly required to love his neighbor as himself. This law he fulfills only by doing for him what he wants him to do for himself: "Haec enim est lex et prophetae, . . ." [8] Methodically applying this principle Luther gives a number of specific applications, of which three are reproduced here as examples:

1. "Doce errantem. Si potuisti et non docuisti, idem est quasi tu ipse seduxisses."
2. "Corripe errantem. Si potuisti et non corripuisti, idem est quasi tu ipse peccare fecisti."
3. "Excusa infamatum. Si potuisti et non excusasti, idem est quasi tu ipse diffamasses." [8]

This systematic development of what he believes is implied in his sermon topic concludes the paragraph devoted to supplying scriptural passages considered relevant by Luther.

Analogies from the Bible and the animal world unite to make up the third authority demanding that man do positive good. First, it is not sufficient for a field on which good seed has been sown not to

[7] Ibid., 59 1.
[8] Ibid., 59 2.

produce thorns and thistles, but it must bring forth fruit if it wishes to be adjudged good. Man who is the "ager Dei" [8] must do likewise. God has given us "semina sua, id est bona externa, interna, media. Non sufficit, quod ista accepimus et non germinamus spinas, offensiones et tribulos, nocendo proximo, sed etiam fructum, bene ex illis faciendo aliis: sic etiam erimus bonus ager." [9] Secondly, "beasts and irrational animals" [9] observe this law of helping others. When one of them suffers, the others are "naturaliter" [9] sad and come to his aid if at all possible. Only man, rational man, does not assist his neighbor in distress: "Et solus homo, qui rationalis est, suo proximo necessitatem patienti non succurrit, non miseretur. O pudor et scandalum!" [9] In fact, man rather adds to than takes away from his fellow-man's "necessitas." [9] Luther quotes and endorses Seneca's observation that man is the most harmful thing to man. Only a human being can hurt another human being in all three realms of good: he can kill, bring into ill repute, and lead astray spiritually, a highly questionable feat of which neither the vegetable nor the animal kingdom is capable. Furthermore, man is controlled by hatred and envy, by which doubtful qualities he far exceeds the ravages of fire and water, of lion and bear.[9]

With this gloomy picture of the real nature of man Luther has reached the end of the general section stressing the necessity of doing good. By way of illustration he adds six special applications of this universal rule. The tenor is the same as in the general discussion. The outstanding fact of human existence is that man does not care in the least about the law and the prophets. There just is not anything even approaching the Christian life to be found among us: "Ex his nostris moribus intelligitur, quod . . . nulla est quasi vita christiana."[10] The human situation is in reality such that, far from doing positive good, we do not even desist from committing actual evil, thus breaking both scriptural precepts, the lesser of not abstaining from evil as well as the greater of not doing good: "Ecce non solum non facimus bonum, sed nondum declinamus a malo, et ita nullam illarum regularum tenemus, sed omnia per contrarium facimus." [10]

In the sorry plight in which we thus find ourselves it behooves us to place the example of the Lord Jesus before us as a mirror in which the true nature of all our works is fully reflected. Emphatically Luther points out that it is Christ and not Luther who uttered the

[8] Ibid., 592.
[9] Ibid., 593.
[10] Ibid., 594.

words of the text: " . . . all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: . . . this is the law and the prophets." Significantly he remarks that this very brief admonition contains as it were the whole of the Bible: "Ecce in quam brevi verbo habetis omnem scripturam!" [10] This is tantamount to saying that Luther in his moral fervor goes so far as to identify the teaching of the entire Bible with the law. He does not hesitate to draw a conclusion of far-reaching importance. Whoever, upon examining himself in the light of Christ's precept, finds himself to live up to it in every respect may fairly entertain the hope that he will be saved: "Quod si se talem invenerit, speret, quod salvabitur." [10] Whoever finds himself to be falling short of it should straightway amend his life lest he perish: "Si autem non, rogo et moneo, ut emendet se, ne pereat, . . ." [10] In other words, individuals who fulfill Christ's law by doing unto others as they would like them to do unto themselves may justly expect to attain unto salvation and to merit life eternal.

In view of the indisputable fact that alarmingly few people follow the example set by Christ Luther feels impelled to add a grave word of warning. There are many, he says bluntly, both in the world and in the monasteries, who have no intention of changing their sinful ways. Let none assume, he urges, that the mere fact that the number of sinners is legion will in the least prove to be an attenuating circumstance on the day of judgment. The full rigor of the law will not be abated one iota for all the appalling number of culprits.[10]

The third and last section of Luther's sermon deals with three questions asked by some people with reference to the actual meaning of the text. First, is it not enough to wish one's neighbor well in one's heart without specifically helping him? Secondly, is it not sufficient if one neither helps nor harms one's fellow-man, but just lets him go his way? Thirdly, are one's possessions not really one's own, and is one not entitled to use one's property as one sees fit? Needless to say, Luther has for all three fundamentally superfluous questions but one and the same answer: a most decided "no" — "non sufficit." [10] It is required of men to live up fully to the law laid down in the Scriptures and to follow completely the words of our text. Luther rejects all compromise and insists on all the implications of Christ's precept. The latter is, characteristically enough for this early stage of Luther's religious development, the quintessence of "omnis scriptura." [10]

It is obvious from this brief outline that Luther's earliest sermon is

[10] Ibid., 594.

quite aptly called by Vogelsang "die eindringlichste Gesetzes- und Gerichtspredigt, die wir von dem jungen Luther haben, ..." [11] This characterization, however, correct and fitting as it is, does not exhaust the signal importance of this early work. It will be our task in the second part of this paper to attempt to point out the extraordinary significance of this sermon for establishing not only the nature of the personal religion of Luther prior to 1513, but also for determining both why and how he was to transcend it not long thereafter. So far as I am aware, neither Vogelsang nor Kiessling nor anyone else for that matter has thus far undertaken to answer, in a sense even to *ask*, this question of the real significance of Luther's earliest sermon and of its place in the imposing structure of his religious thought.

No student of the religion of Martin Luther can fail to be struck by the gulf which exists between this sermon and practically all other writings to come from his pen. This difference is indubitably not one of degree, but of kind. We are leaving one religious realm for a wholly new one in moving from the earliest sermon to the Lectures on Romans. The real question is: what exactly *is* the difference between these two radically opposed realms of religious thought?

To avoid all possible misunderstanding, let it be said at the outset that the religion expressed in the earliest sermon is both profound and genuine. There can be little doubt that it bears the unmistakable stamp of Luther's genius: despite its general scholastic form the sermon issues from a full heart and is definitely, in Nietzsche's words, written with his own blood. No one can fail to recognize that it is rooted in personal experience, the experience of a keen observer. If its author had written nothing else, this sermon would still be a remarkable document of a stern and uncompromising religious spirit of the highest possible ethical standards.

Let us attempt to analyze the religion of this early sermon somewhat more closely. It is clearly a religion of doing, of positive action. The sermon is intensely moralistic, challenging man's best efforts to attain the goal set by Christ's example. The burden of the entire sermon is its unyielding demand that the law be fulfilled in the most positive manner imaginable. The command "fac bonum" is its very core.

Beyond this rigid insistence on the complete living up to Christ's law the implied assumption that man *can* do so if he but tries hard enough should be noted. Moreover, the accomplishment of good actions, held to be quite within the reach of man, is asserted repeatedly to lead

[11] Loc. cit., 115.

to, and to suffice for, salvation. Really helping one's neighbor in the three fields of human endeavor outlined above is credited with meriting eternal life for the doer. Luther says plainly that assisting one's fellow-man to the degree that one wishes to be assisted by him is in every respect the true Christian life. He goes so far as to maintain emphatically that the law, thus conceived and carried out, is identical with the teaching of the Bible as a whole: "Ecce in quam brevi verbo habetis omnem scripturam!" [10]

Comparing the religion of this sermon with that of the Lectures on Romans, we find a complete change. Instead of the feeling of confidence that man, while unfortunately not willing to live up to the law of Christ, is nonetheless capable of so doing, there is in Romans the full realization that man is utterly incapable of fulfilling the law. It is an inescapable conclusion drawn from this unromantic insight that man can under no circumstances merit eternal life or work out his own salvation since he falls far short of his bounden duty of carrying out Christ's precepts. Furthermore, instead of defining the true Christian life in terms of the good deeds to be constantly and thoroughly achieved, Luther henceforth holds that the genuine Christian life consists exclusively in fiducial faith. Finally, *the whole Bible far from being reducible to the law will then be identified altogether with Luther's comprehensive conception of faith.* In short, a greater contrast can scarcely be found than that existing between the earliest sermon and the first New Testament Lectures. To put it as concisely as possible, the religion of the former is essentially one of work righteousness (generously construed) and merit, whereas that of the latter is completely dominated by the concept of *sola fides.* Faith, which played a minor rôle in the sermon, will soon become the exclusive force imperiously subordinating everything to its domain.

If we now turn from the more or less factual establishment of the essential differences between the religiosity of the sermon and that of the Lectures on Romans to the question as to why and how this fundamental change took place, we should bear in mind that we are considering an extraordinarily difficult matter. The issue before us concerns nothing less than the origin, or at least an important aspect of the origin, of the faith-centered religion of Martin Luther.

In my opinion, Luther's earliest extant sermon contains the highest possible development of a religion of law. It is inconceivable to me how Luther could have gone much beyond the stage attained in this

[10] Ibid., 594.

sermon. In other words, Luther, before 1513, had reached the acme of moralistic religion.

It is essential to remember this fact. In order to do justice to the change which was soon to take place in Luther's basic religious convictions it is necessary to view it against the background provided by this sermon. The new religion of 'justification by faith alone' will then be seen to spring from the earlier stage of the religion of works and the law. If it is true, as it undoubtedly is, that only the greatest and deepest representatives of a certain view of life are in a position to overcome it and to scan new horizons, then it is quite clear why and how Luther, having progressed to the utmost boundaries of the religion of law, could advance only by outgrowing it and 'discovering' new vistas of religion. Only a sincere and passionate searcher after religious truth who had completely exhausted the traditional avenues could ultimately find a new approach and 'discover' a new aspect of God.

While it is of course difficult, if not actually impossible, to lay bare the various stages in the evolution of the new conception of religion, a cardinal transitional step can, I believe, be determined with some degree of certainty. It would seem that Luther's keen observation that people, both clergy and laymen, were far from living up to the law of Christ proved to be a decisive experience. It was surely this realization that had led Luther to exclaim in the course of his sermon that the true Christian life, full obedience to the law, was largely non-existent. Moreover, spiritually utterly honest with himself as he was, Luther must have been painfully aware that he himself also fell seriously short of the ideal he had outlined in his discourse. It is my conviction that it was this uncomfortable insight that proved to be the chief motive force behind his relentless search for a new foundation of the good life, which Luther, for one, was totally unwilling to relinquish after the inherited props had collapsed so far as he was concerned.

Thus, if I read the sermon correctly and if I interpret its implications aright, Luther's religion of *sola fides* was the upshot of the most intense legal and moralistic religion. It is a fact that Luther himself time and again suggested some such origin of his religion of faith when he was under attack for his reputed indifference to good works. Smarting under this unjust accusation Luther was wont to remind his foes of his inexorable insistence on works that were "*grund*gut" rather than "*schein*gut." The former being both absolutely required of men and beyond their best efforts, he had found,

by dint of searching thought and harrowing experience, a 'new' way to 'achieve' them.

While we have of course long known these facts from Luther's reminiscences in his later works, we have not thus far had access to reasonably extensive contemporary source material. This has at last been 'found' by Vogelsang's establishment of the early origin of the sermon under discussion. The great significance of this scholar's discovery of the probable date of our sermon lies in its providing us with hitherto sorely missed contemporary evidence. We now know from an abundant source dating earlier than 1513 basic aspects of Luther's pre-reformational piety. This religion with its emphasis on 'self-righteousness' and its belief in the possibility of 'self-righteousness' was the rich soil from the very excess and fertility of which was soon to emerge the religion of exclusive grace and faith with its God-given righteousness.

H. S. Bluhm

Yale University